Oxford Church Text Books

A History of the American Church

LEIGHTON COLEMAN

BX
5880
C68
1906
GTU
Storage

Frederick Grant.
1913.

Oxford Church Text Books

A History of the American Church

TO THE CLOSE OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

BY THE RIGHT REV.

LEIGHTON COLEMAN, S.T.D., LL.D.

BISHOP OF DELAWARE

GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION LIBRARY 1962

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

SECOND EDITION

NEW YORK

EDWIN S. GORHAM

CHURCH MISSIONS HOUSE, FOURTH AVENUE, AND 22ND STREET

1906

BX
5880
C68
1986

MGEZ
C697

PREFACE

In writing the following History of that branch of the Catholic Church, known in law as the Protestant Episcopal Church, in the United States of America, the author has had in mind the fact of its circulation both in Great Britain and in America.

On this account some explanations are made, and some facts are stated which, otherwise, might have been omitted, but which he believes to be at least helpful to the more complete understanding of the subject in both countries.

CONTENTS

CHAP.		PAGE
	The American Episcopate,	iv
I.	The Beginning,	1
II.	The First Part of the Eighteenth Century,	11
III.	The Church and the Wesleys,	23
IV.	Bishops and Independence,	34
V.	The Close of the Eighteenth Century,	45
VI.	The Beginning of the Nineteenth Century,	59
VII.	The Church Revival,	71
VIII.	Missions,	85
IX.	Education and Progress,	92
	Chronological Table,	108
	Presiding Bishops of the American Church,	109
	General Conventions,	109
	Index,	110

No.	NAME.	Order.	SEE.	Consecrated.	Deceased.	Age: Years.
1	Samuel Seabury,	1st	Connecticut (1st, Rhode Island, 1790),	1784	1796	66
2	William White,	1st	Pennsylvania,	1787	1836	88
3	Samuel Provoost	1st	New York,	1787	1815	83
4	James Madison,	1st	Virginia,	1790	1812	62
5	Thomas John Claggett,	1st	Maryland,	1792	1816	73
6	Robert Smith,	1st	South Carolina,	1795	1801	69
7	Edward Bass,	1st	Massachusetts (2nd, Rhode Island),	1797	1803	76
8	Abraham Jarvis,	2nd	Connecticut,	1797	1815	73
9	Benjamin Moore	2nd	New York (Co.-ad.), Bp. 1815	1801	1816	67
10	Samuel Parker,	2nd	Massachusetts,	1804	1830	60
11	John Henry Hobart,	3rd	New York (Co.-ad.), Bp. 1816	1811	1830	54
12	Alexander Viets Griswold,	1st	Eastern Diocese,	1811	1843	76
13	Theodore Dehon,	2nd	South Carolina,	1812	1817	40
14	Richard Channing Moore,	2nd	Virginia,	1813	1841	79
15	James Kemp,	2nd	Maryland (Suff.), Bp. 1816	1814	1827	63
16	John Croes,	1st	New Jersey,	1815	1832	70
17	Nathaniel Bowen,	3rd	South Carolina,	1818	1839	60
18	Philander Chase,	1st	Ohio, 1st Illinois (1835),	1819	1852	76
19	Thomas Church Brownell,	3rd	Connecticut,	1819	1865	85
20	John Stark Ravenscroft,	1st	North Carolina,	1823	1830	58
21	Henry Ustick Onderdonk,	2nd	Pennsylvania (Asst.) Bp. 1836	1827	1858	69
22	William Meade,	3rd	Virginia (Asst.), Bp. 1841	1829	1862	72
23	William Murray Stone,	3rd	Maryland,	1830	1838	58
24	Benj. Tredwell Onderdonk,	4th	New York,	1830	1861	69
25	Levi Silliman Ives .	2nd	North Carolina,	1831	1867	70
26	John Henry Hopkins,	1st	Vermont (3rd Acting),	1832	1868	75
27	Benjamin Bosworth Smith,	1st	Kentucky,	1832	1884	89
28	Charles Pettit McIlvaine,	2nd	Ohio,	1832	1873	74
29	George Washington Doane,	2nd	New Jersey,	1832	1859	59
30	James Hervey Otey,	1st	Tennessee,	1834	1863	63
31	Jackson Kemper,	1st	Mo. and Ind. (Miss.) (1st, Wis., 1854),	1835	1870	80
32	Saml. Allen McCoskry,	1st	Michigan (2nd Acting),	1836	1886	81
33	Leonidas Polk,	1st	Arkansas (Miss.) (1st, Louisiana, 1841),	1838	1864	58
34	Wm. Heathcote De Lancey,	1st	Western New York,	1839	1865	67
35	Christopher Edwards Gadsden,	4th	South Carolina,	1840	1852	66
36	William Rollinson Whittingham,	4th	Maryland,	1840	1879	73
37	Stephen Elliott,	1st	Georgia,	1841	1866	60
38	Alfred Lee,	1st	Delaware,	1841	1887	79
39	John Johns,	4th	Virginia (Asst.), Bp. 1862	1842	1876	79
40	Manton Eastburn,	3rd	Massachusetts (Asst., 4th Acting),	1842	1872	71
41	John Prentiss Kewly Henshaw,	1st	Rhode Island (4th Acting),	1843	1852	60
42	Carlton Chase,	1st	New Hampshire (2nd Acting),	1844	1870	75
43	Nicholas Hamner Cobbs,	1st	Alabama (3rd Acting),	1844	1861	64
44	Cicero Stephens Hawks,	1st	Missouri,	1844	1868	55
45	William Jones Boone,	1st	Amoy, China (Miss.),	1844	1864	53

46	George Washington Freeman,	2nd	Arkansas (Miss.) and of the So.-West,	1844	1858	68
47	Horatio Southgate,	1st	Constantinople (Miss.) Resigned, 1850,	1844	1894	81
48	Alonzo Potter,	3rd	Pennsylvania, (Died on shipboard)	1845	1865	64
49	George Burgess,	1st	Maine (3rd Acting), Died at sea	1847	1866	56
50	George Upfold,	1st	Indiana,	1849	1872	76
51	William Mercer Green,	1st	Mississippi (3rd Acting),	1850	1887	88
52	John Payne,	1st	Africa (Miss.),	1851	1874	59
53	Francis Huger Rutledge,	1st	Florida,	1851	1866	67
54	John Williams,	4th	Connecticut (Asst.), Bp. 1865	1851	1899	81
55	Henry John Whitehouse,	2nd	Illinois,	1851	1874	70
56	Jonathan Mayhew Mainwright,	5th	New York (Provis.),	1852	1854	62
57	Thomas Frederick Davis,	5th	South Carolina,	1853	1871	67
58	Thomas Atkinson,	3rd	North Carolina (4th Acting),	1853	1881	73
59	William Ingraham Kip,	1st	California (Miss.) Bp. of Diocese, 1857	1853	1893	81
60	Thomas Fielding Scott,	1st	Oregon and Wash. Territory (Miss.),	1854	1867	..
61	Henry Washington Lee,	1st	Iowa (2nd Acting),	1854	1874	59
62	Horatio Potter,	6th	New York (Provisional), Bp. 1861	1854	1887	84
63	Thomas March Clark,	2nd	Rhode Island,	1854	1903	91
64	Samuel Bowman,		Pennsylvania (Asst.),	1858	1861	61
65	Alexander Gregg,	1st	Texas,	1859	1893	73
66	Wm. Henry Odenheimer,	3rd	New Jersey (1st North. New Jer. 1874),	1859	1879	62
67	Gregory Thurston Bedell,	3rd	Ohio (Asst.), Bp. 1873. Resigned, 1889	1859	1892	74
68	Henry Benjamin Whipple,	1st	Minnesota,	1859	1901	79
69	Henry Champlin Law,	3rd	Ark. (Miss.) (1st, Easton, tr. Apr. 1, 1869),	1859	1885	61
70	Joseph Cruikshank Talbot,	1st	North West (Miss.). 2nd, Indiana, 1865, Asst. 1865, Bp. 1872	1860	1883	66
71	William Bacon Stevens,	4th	Pennsylvania (Asst.), Bp. 1865	1862	1887	71
72	Richard Hooker Wilmer,	2nd	Alabama (4th Acting),	1862	1900	84
73	Thomas Hubbard Vail,	1st	Kansas,	1864	1889	76
74	Arthur Cleveland Coxe,	2nd	Western New York (Asst.), Bp. 1865	1865	1896	78
75	Charles Todd Quintard,	2nd	Tennessee,	1865	1898	73
76	Robert Harper Clarkson,	1st	Nebraska (Miss.),	1865	1884	57
77	George Maxwell Randall,	1st	Colorado (Miss.),	1865	1873	62
78	John Barrett Kerfoot,	1st	Pittsburg,	1866	1881	65
79	Channing Moore Williams,	2nd	China & Japan (Miss.). 1st Yedo, '74. R., '89	1866	..	..
80	Joseph Pere Bell Wilmer,	2nd	Louisiana,	1866	1878	66
81	George David Cummins,		Kentucky (Asst.),	1866	1876	53
82	Wm. Edmond Armitage,	2nd	Wisconsin (Asst.), Bp. 1870	1866	1873	43
83	Henry Adams Neely,	2nd	Maine (4th Acting),	1867	1899	69
84	Danl. Sylvester Tuttle,	1st	Utah (Miss.) (3rd Missouri, 1886),	1867	..	..
85	John Freeman Young,	2nd	Florida,	1867	1885	65
86	John Watrous Beckwith,	2nd	Georgia,	1868	1890	59
87	Francis McNeece Whittle,	5th	Virginia (Asst.), Bp. 1876	1868	1902	78
88	Wm. Henry Augustus Bissell,	2nd	Vermont,	1868	1893	78
89	Charles Franklin Robertson,	2nd	Missouri,	1868	1886	51
90	Benjamin Wistar Morris,	2nd	Oregon (Miss.) and Wash. to 1880,	1868	..	..
91	Abram Newkirk Littlejohn,	1st	Long Island,	1869	1901	76
92	William Croswell Doane,	1st	Albany,	1869	..	..
93	Frederic Dan Huntington,	1st	Central New York,	1869	1904	85
94	Ozi William Whitaker,	1st	Nevada (Miss.), Asst. Bp. Pa., '86; Bp. '87	1869	..	..
95	Henry Niles Pierce,	4th	Arkansas (Miss.),	1870	1899	78

No.	NAME.	Order.	SEE.	Consecrated.	Deceased.	Age: Years
96	William Woodruff Niles,	2nd	New Hampshire,	1870	..	..
97	William Pinkney,	5th	Maryland (Asst.), Bp. 1879	1870	1883	73
98	William Bell White Howe,	6th	South Carolina,	1871	1894	71
99	Mark Antony De Wolfe Howe,	1st	Central Pennsylvania,	1871	1895	86
100	William Hobart Hare,	1st	Niobrara (Miss.), South Dakota, 1883,	1873	..	..
101	John Gottlieb Auer,	2nd	Cape Palmas, Africa (Miss.),	1873	1874	41
102	Benjamin Henry Paddock,	4th	Massachusetts,	1873	1891	68
103	Theodore Benedict Lyman,	4th	North Carolina (Asst.), Bp. 1881	1873	1893	78
104	John Franklin Spalding,	2nd	Colorado (Miss.), Diocese, 1887	1873	1902	73
105	Edward Randolph Welles,	3rd	Wisconsin, Milwaukee, 1886	1874	1888	58
106	Robert W. Barnwell Elliott,	1st	Western Texas (Miss.),	1874	1887	47
107	John Henry Ducachet Wingfield,	1st	Northern California (Miss.),	1874	1898	64
108	Alexander Charles Garrett,	1st	No. Tex. (Miss.), Bp. Dallas, 1895	1874	..	..
109	William Forbes Adams,	1st	New Mex. (Miss.). R'd, '76; Bp. Easton '87	1875	..	..
110	Thomas Underwood Dudley,	2nd	Kentucky (Asst.), Bp. 1884	1875	1904	66
111	John Scarborough,	4th	New Jersey,	1875	..	..
112	George de Normandie Gillespie,	1st	Western Michigan,	1875	..	..
113	Thomas Augustus Jaggar,	1st	Southern Ohio, Resigned, 1904	1875	..	..
114	William Edward McLaren,	3rd	Illinois, Chicago, 1883	1875	..	..
115	John Henry Hobart Brown,	1st	Fond-du-Lac,	1875	1888	56
116	William Stevens Perry,	2nd	Iowa,	1876	1898	66
117	Charles Clifton Penice,	3rd	Cape Palmas (Miss.), Resigned, 1883	1877	..	..
118	Saml. Isaac Jos. Schereschewsky,	2nd	Shanghai, China (Miss.), Resigned, 1883,	1877	..	..
119	Alexander Burgess,	1st	Quincy,	1878	1901	81
120	George William Peterkin,	1st	West Virginia,	1878	..	..
121	George Franklin Seymour,	1st	Springfield,	1878	..	..
122	Samuel Smith Harris,	2nd	Michigan,	1879	1888	46
123	Thomas Alfred Starkey,	2nd	Northern New Jersey, Newark, 1886,	1880	1903	84
124	John Nicholas Galleher,	3rd	Louisiana,	1880	1891	52
125	George Kelly Dunlop,	2nd	New Mexico and Arizona (Miss.),	1880	1888	57
126	Leigh Richmond Brewer,	1st	Montana (Miss.), 1st Montana, 1904,	1880	..	..
127	John Adams Paddock,	1st	Washington (Miss.),	1880	1894	69
128	Cortlandt Whitehead,	2nd	Pittsburg,	1882	..	..
129	Hugh Miller Thompson,	2nd	Mississippi (Asst.), Bp. 1887,	1883	1902	72
130	David Buel Knickerbacker,	3rd	Indiana,	1883	1894	61
131	Henry Codman Potter,	7th	New York (Asst.), Bp. 1887,	1883	..	..
132	Alfred Magill Randolph,	1st	Virginia (Asst.), Bp. South Va., 1892	1883	..	..
133	William David Walker,	1st	No. Dakota (Miss.), 3rd Westn. N.Y., 1897,	1883	..	..
134	Alfred Augustin Watson,	1st	East Carolina,	1884	..	..
135	William Jones Boone,	4th	Shanghai (Miss.),	1884	1891	45
136	Nelson Somerville Rulison,	2nd	Central Pennsylvania (Asst.), Bp. 1895,	1884	1897	55
137	William Paret,	6th	Maryland,	1885	..	..
138	George Worthington,	2nd	Nebraska,	1885	..	..
139	Samuel David Ferguson,	4th	Cape Palmas (Miss.),	1885	..	..
140	Edwin Gardner Weed,	3rd	Florida,	1886	..	..

141	Mahlon Norris Gilbert,		Minnesota (Asst.),	1886	1900	51
142	Elisha Smith Thomas,	2nd	Kansas (Asst.), Bp. 1889,	1887	1895	61
143	Ethelbert Talbot,	1st	Wyo. and Ida. (Miss.), 3rd C. P., 1898,	1887	..	..
144	James Steptoe Johnston,	2nd	Western Texas (Miss.), 1st Wt. Tex., 1904,	1888	..	..
145	Abiel Leonard,	2nd	Nev. and Utah (Miss.), 1st Salt Lake, 1900,	1888	1903	55
146	Leighton Coleman,	2nd	Delaware,	1888	..	..
147	John Mills Kendrick,	3rd	Arizona and New Mexico,	1889	..	..
148	Boyd Vincent,	2nd	Southern Ohio (Asst.), Bp. 1904,	1889	..	..
149	Cyrus Frederick Knight,	4th	Milwaukee,	1889	1891	59
150	Charles Chapman Grafton,	2nd	Fond-du-Lac,	1889	..	..
151	William Andrew Leonard,	4th	Ohio,	1889	..	..
152	Thomas Frederick Davies,	3rd	Michigan,	1889	1905	..
153	Anson Rogers Graves,	1st	The Platte,	1890	..	..
154	William Ford Nichols,	2nd	California (Asst.), Bp. 1893,	1890	..	..
155	Edwin Robert Atwill,	1st	West Missouri, 1st Kans. City, Mo., 1904,	1890	..	..
156	Henry Melville Jackson,	..	Alabama (Asst.), Resigned, 1900,	1891	1900	50
157	Davis Sessums,	4th	Louisiana (Asst.), Bp. 1891,	1891	..	..
158	Phillips Brooks,	5th	Massachusetts,	1891	1893	57
159	Isaac Lea Nicholson,	5th	Milwaukee,	1891	..	..
160	Cleland Kinloch Nelson,	3rd	Georgia,	1892	..	..
161	Charles Reuben Hale,	..	Springfield (Asst.),	1892	1900	63
162	George Herbert Kinsolving,	2nd	Texas (Asst.), Bp. 1893,	1892	..	..
163	Lemuel Henry Wells,	1st	Spokane (Miss.),	1892	..	..
164	William Crane Gray,	1st	Southern Fla. (Miss.),	1892	..	..
165	Francis Key Brooke,	1st	Oklahoma (Miss.),	1893	..	..
166	William Morris Barker,	1st	W. Colo. (Miss.), 2nd Tacoma (Miss.), 1895,	1893	1901	46
167	John McKim,	3rd	Japan (Miss.),	1893	..	..
168	Frederick Rogers Graves,	3rd	China (Miss.),	1893	..	..
169	Ellison Capers,	7th	South Car. (Asst.), Bp. 1894,	1893	..	..
170	Thomas Frank Gailor,	3rd	Tennessee (Asst.), Bp. 1898,	1893	..	..
171	William Lawrence,	6th	Massachusetts,	1893	..	..
172	Joseph Blount Cheshire, Jr.,	5th	North Car. (Asst.), Bp. 1893,	1893	..	..
173	Arthur Crawshay Alliston Hall,	3rd	Vermont,	1894	..	..
174	John Brockenbrough Newton,	..	Virginia (Asst.),	1894	1897	58
175	John Hazen White,	4th	Indiana, 1st Mich. City, 1899,	1895	..	..
176	Frank Rosebrook Millspaugh,	3rd	Kansas,	1895	..	..
177	Peter Trimble Rowe,	1st	Alaska (Miss),	1895	..	..
178	Lewis William Burton,	1st	Lexington,	1896	..	..
179	Joseph Horsfall Johnson,	1st	Los Angelos,	1896	..	..
180	Henry Yates Satterlee,	1st	Washington, D.C.,	1896	..	..
181	Gershom Mott Williams,	1st	Marquette,	1896	..	..
182	James Dow Morrison,	1st	Duluth,	1897	..	..
183	Chauncey Bunce Brewster,	5th	Connecticut (Coadjutor), Bp. 1899,	1897	..	..
184	Robert Atkinson Gibson,	6th	Virginia (Coadjutor), Bp. 1902,	1897	..	..
185	William Neilson McVickar,	3rd	Rhode Island (Coadjutor), Bp. 1903,	1898	..	..
186	William Montgomery Brown,	5th	Arkansas (Coadjutor), Bp. 1899,	1898	..	..
187	Junius Moore Horner,	1st	Asheville, N. C. (Miss.),	1898	..	..
188	William Hall Moreland,	1st	Sacramento, Cal. (Miss.),	1899	..	..
189	Samuel Cook Edsall,	2nd	N. Dak. (Miss.), 2nd Minn., 1901,	1899	..	..
190	Theodore Nevin Morrison,	3rd	Iowa,	1899	..	..
191	James Bowen Funsten,	1st	Boise (Miss.),	1899	..	..

SUCCESSION OF AMERICAN BISHOPS—*continued.*

No.	NAME.	Order.	SEE.	Consecrated.	Deceased.	Age: Years.
192	Joseph Marshall Francis,	5th	Indiana,	1899	..	..
193	Arthur Llewellyn Williams,	..	Nebraska (Coadjutor),	1899	..	..
194	William Loyall Gravatt,	..	West Virginia (Coadjutor),	1899	..	..
195	Sidney Catlin Partridge,	1st	Kyoto, Japan (Miss.),	1900	..	..
196	Robert Codman,	3rd	Maine,	1900	..	..
197	Charles P. Anderson,	..	Chicago (Coadjutor),	1900	..	..
198	Robert Woodward Barnwell,	3rd	Alabama,	1900	1902	52
199	Reginald Heber Weller, Jr.,	..	Fond-du-Lac (Coadjutor),	1900	..	..
200	Frederic William Taylor,	2nd	Quincy,	1901	1903	50
201	Cameron Mann,	3rd	No. Dak. (Miss.),	1901	..	..
202	Charles Henry Brent,	1st	Philippine Islands (Miss.),	1901	..	..
203	Frederic William Keator,	3rd	Olympia (Miss.),	1902	..	..
204	Frederick Burgess,	2nd	Long Island,	1902	..	..
205	James Addison Ingle,	1st	Hankow, China (Miss.),	1902	1903	36
206	Alexander Hamilton Vinton,	1st	Western Mass.,	1902	..	..
207	Charles Sanford Olmsted,	3rd	Colorado,	1902	..	..
208	Alexander Mackay-Smith,	..	Pennsylvania (Coadjutor),	1902	..	..
209	James Heartt Van Buren,	1st	Porto Rico (Miss.),	1902	..	..
210	Henry Bond Restarick,	1st	Honolulu (Miss.),	1902	..	..
211	Charles Tyler Olmsted,	2nd	Cent. N. Y. (Coadjutor), Bp. 1904,	1902	..	..
212	Charles M. Beckwith,	4th	Alabama,	1902	..	..
213	Sheldon M. Griswold,	1st	Salina, Kan. (Miss.),	1903	..	..
214	Theodore Du Bose Bratton,	3rd	Mississippi,	1903	..	..
215	Edwin Stevens Lines,	3rd	Newark, N. J.,	1903	..	..
216	M. Edward Fawcett,	3rd	Quincy,	1904	..	..
217	David Hummel Greer,	..	New York (Coadjutor),	1904	..	..
218	Richard Henry Nelson,	..	Albany (Coadjutor),	1904	..	..
219	Edward William Osborne,	..	Springfield (Coadjutor),	1904	..	..
220	Robert Strange,	..	East Carolina (Coadjutor),	1904	..	..
221	Logan Herbert Roots,	2nd	Hankow, China (Miss.),	1904	..	..
222	Franklin Spencer Spalding,	3rd	Salt Lake,	1904	..	..
223	Henry Dameral Aves,	2nd	Mexico,	1904	..	..
224	Albion Williamson Knight,	1st	Cuba,	1904	..	..
225	Charles Albion Woodcock,	3rd	Kentucky,	1905	..	..
226	James Henry Darlington,	1st	Harrisburg,	1905	..	..
227	Frederick Foote Johnson,	..	South Dakota (Coadjutor),	1905	..	..
228	Charles David Williams,	4th	Michigan,	1906	..	..
229	Edward Melville Parker,	..	New Hampshire (Coadjutor),	1906	..	..
230	John Newton McCormick,	..	Western Michigan (Coadjutor),	1906	..	..
231	William Walter Webb,	..	Milwaukee (Coadjutor),	1906	..	..

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN CHURCH

CHAPTER I

THE BEGINNING

A Branch of the Catholic Church.—In writing or reading a history of the Church in the United States of America, one must bear in mind the fact that the American Church is but a branch of the Catholic Church. The term 'American Church' is merely a geographical one, used as a matter of convenience, and not as meaning to imply that she is a self-centred and independent whole. Indeed, the American Church is only a reality as she is an integral and indivisible part of the Catholic Church. It is as a contribution, therefore, to the history of the whole that this volume proceeds to record the life and work of that part of it which belongs to the region more particularly involved.

First Services.—While this special history begins, practically, with the colonies that settled on the Atlantic coast, it is not to be forgotten that the first services of the Anglican Prayer Book were held some years earlier on the Pacific coast. These were held on or about St. John Baptist's Day, 1579, by the Rev. Francis Fletcher, the chaplain who sailed with Sir Francis Drake. His place of landing is generally believed to have been Drake's Bay, California. He officiated for something like six weeks, and may thus be fairly reckoned as the

pioneer in claiming for Christ the territory now belonging to the North American Republic.[1]

We have records of occasional services and other ministerial acts, including the baptism of the native Indians, performed as early as 1587 in North Carolina and Virginia. There is good ground for believing that public services were held by devout laymen in parts of New England as early in the following century as 1602.

The Jamestown Settlement.—In the spring of 1607 a company of English colonists landed at Jamestown, Virginia. One of this number was the Rev. Robert Hunt, M.A., who, out of a missionary zeal, had resigned his living at Reculver in Kent. Arrangements were made for daily services, and these were attended gladly by the emigrants, under the shade of the primeval forest trees. An altar was soon erected, composed of the simplest materials; and on the third Sunday after Trinity, June 21, this zealous priest, whose life and labours were ever of the most exemplary character, had his first celebration of the Holy Communion. That this privilege was appreciated by the worshippers is evidenced by the fact that, when the supply of liquors began to run short, they willingly reserved the most suitable of them for use in the Sacrament.

Captain Smith and Pocahontas.—A touch of romance is given to this initial period by the pathetic story of the deliverance from the savages of Captain John Smith (afterwards the honoured President of the Council) by the beautiful Indian princess, Pocahontas, whose subsequent visit to England, with her English husband, attracted so much attention from all grades of society. Great credit is ascribed to Smith by the famous American historian Bancroft, who says of him: 'He was the father of Virginia, the true leader who first planted the Saxon race within the borders of the United States.'[2]

[1] In Golden Gate Park, San Francisco, from which in clear weather Drake's Bay is visible, a beautiful and substantial stone cross has been erected at the expense of Mr. George W. Childs, a liberal and public-spirited citizen of Philadelphia, to commemorate these events.

[2] *History of the United States*, vol. i. p. 138.

The New England Settlements.—Mention has already been made of occasional lay-services in New England. Before the end of the year 1607—some contend before the beginning of the church at Jamestown, Virginia—a church was erected, under the auspices of the Popham colony, on the shores of the Sagadehoc (now the Kennebec) river, in what is now known as Maine. The Rev. Richard Seymour (in all probability, the great-grandson of the Duke of Somerset) was the priest who thus by his services antedated those of the 'Pilgrim Fathers' in these parts by a number of years.

From this time on, throughout the rest of the seventeenth century, various efforts were put forth along the line of the Atlantic coast for the evangelisation of this newly-acquired territory. The sovereigns of England, by the very terms of the charters which they granted, showed themselves ready to respond to the earnest appeals made by the missionary-minded clergymen of the day. From different parts of the mother-country, some such clergymen were found ready to answer these appeals in person, who, despite the perils and discomforts then involved in ocean voyages, betook themselves to labour in behalf as well of their fellow-churchmen as of the destitute aborigines. In the colony at Weymouth, Massachusetts (formed in 1623), the Ecclesiastical Commissioner was the Rev. William Morrell. The Rev. John Lyford came to Plymouth, Massachusetts, in 1624. Upon his removal in 1627 to Virginia, the services were maintained by Roger Conant, one of the sturdiest laymen of his day.

The Maryland Settlements.—Not long after Captain Claiborne's settlement in Kent Island in 1629, and therefore prior to the arrival of Lord Baltimore's colony, the Rev. Richard James, librarian to the famous antiquary Sir Robert Cotton, officiated there and in other parts of Maryland. In 1650, the Rev. William Wilkinson was rector of St. George's, St. Mary's County; and in 1676, when the Rev. John Yeo wrote from Maryland, Lord Baltimore also wrote that there were four clergymen of the Church of England in the Province, with decent maintenance.

Roman Catholics Intruders.—This reference to the

priority of the settlement of Maryland by Churchmen may be further emphasised by mentioning the fact that when, at a subsequent period, the Roman Catholic colonists began to arrive, they did not come to establish a National or Provincial Branch of the Catholic Church, in accordance with early canons and the true polity of the Church, but, rather, to extend the Papacy, in direct violation of the canons, especially the eighth of the Council of Ephesus. Furthermore, the Anglican Church was fully established, with three bishops and other ecclesiastical organisation, several years before the arrival of the first Roman bishop (John Carroll). The indisputable facts of history prove clearly that the intrusion in the United States was from the Roman Church.

First Services elsewhere. — The Rev. John Michell settled in New Hampshire in 1633. The Rev. Morgan Jones would seem to have been the first clergyman who officiated (in 1660) in South Carolina, the Rev. John Yeo (who migrated from Maryland) in Delaware in 1677, and in New York the Rev. Nicholas Van Rensselaer (who came over with Sir Edmund Andros) in 1674, and the Rev. Charles Wolley, chaplain of the forces, in 1678. About this same time, regular services were held in New Jersey. They were established in Pennsylvania at a somewhat later date, 1694–5.

Early Persecutions.—It was a time, too, of persecution at the hands of those who (as in every age) boasted most of their own piety and liberality. But it was reserved for a later period to have this spirit of intolerance manifest itself the more violently, of which something will be said when that period has been reached. Some of the clergy were fearless not only as to doctrine, but also as to discipline. The Rev. Thoroughgood Moore, feeling that the notorious evil-living of Lieutenant-Governor Ingolsby of New Jersey was a scandal to the Church, refused him the Holy Communion; whereupon he was arrested and imprisoned. The Rev. Mr. Brooke espoused his cause, and brought about his release, only himself to fall under the ban and persecution of Lord Cornbury, the governor. When able to do so, both these clergymen started for England; but both died on the voyage.

Illiberality of Laymen.—The chronic complaint as to the want among the laity of a proper degree of liberality in their pecuniary gifts may be lodged against at least some of the early colonists. One of the first missionaries of the S. P. G. declares, in a letter to the Society, that he had not received from either of his two cures a single penny during the year, 'they being willing,' as he goes on to say, 'to purchase heaven without money and without price.' In many instances the larger share, in some cases even the whole, of the stipends was paid in tobacco, which the incumbents were obliged, as best they could, to convert into more necessary commodities or into money. In some parishes, the fixed salary was 16,000 lbs. per annum, the equivalent then of £80 to £100, according to the quality of the plant. The cost of three surplices was estimated to be equal to 5000 lbs., nearly one-third of the rector's stipend, A parish clerk, for setting the Psalms, was paid 500 lbs. annually. That much stress was laid upon the possession of surplices—however so costly, comparatively, they seem to have been—is evident from the complaint which the clergy of these early days lodged with the Bishop of London because they were obliged to administer the Sacraments 'without the decent habits and proper Ornaments and Vessels which our established Liturgy requires.'

Colonial Life.—Many charming accounts have been written of the life in Virginia and elsewhere during these early colonial days. While, doubtless, the hardships which the original settlers had to endure were many and, in some instances, great, there was yet with them all a flavour of romance and novelty which made them not altogether unpalatable. In the beginning, taverns were, of course, unknown; and until their necessity arose because of the great tax upon the planters' hospitality, the people became better acquainted with each other than would otherwise have been the case.

The Hospitality of Clergymen.—But while the layman was somewhat relieved by the new order of things, the clergyman was still expected to entertain as many strangers as might chance to come his way. There was, however, a compensation in this necessity; for by this

means he came the sooner and the more intimately to know the members of his flock.

Influence of Parsons.—In these early days, too, the clergyman became almost at once a person of influence in his neighbourhood—as in English villages, *the* person, or parson—by reason of his education and culture. On this account he was much in demand as a private tutor, or teacher in schools.[1] Thus, while by other means he was enabled to reach the masses, by this he more directly reached those who, as statesmen, judges, lawyers, physicians, and merchants, occupied the highest positions in society. Indeed, it has been asserted by some of the writers on this period of American history that the prominence of leaders, both in State and National halls, during the formation of the Federal Government, was mainly due to the instructions of the much-belied colonial clergy.

Religious Fines.—Reference has been made already to the high estimation in which the Blessed Eucharist was held by these early settlers. They were also very strenuous as to Holy Baptism. A fine of not less than 2000 lbs. of tobacco was imposed upon parents who neglected to have their children christened. This anxiety extended also to slaves and their children, it being, however, agreed (when a sharp controversy arose on the subject) that such persons and children were not freed by reason of being baptized.

Attendance upon public worship was not only urged by the clergy, but enforced by the law. At one time, negligence as to this duty was punishable by a fine of 500 lbs. of tobacco for each and every person inexcusably absent. And this, too, when such attendance was frequently beset with much inconvenience and discomfort as to travel, and with the fear of sudden attacks upon life by the hostile Indians. Firearms, therefore, became with many the constant companions of their Prayer Books.

[1] The Rev. Archibald Campbell, rector of Washington parish, Westmoreland County, Virginia, is reported to have had among his pupils at school Chief-Justice Marshall, Presidents Madison and Monroe, and probably General Washington.

Early Educational Efforts.—The interest of Churchmen was not confined exclusively to spiritual affairs. Many of them were much exercised as to the intellectual education which could be afforded in the new land. Not a few of them were graduates of English universities; and these knew the better what a deprivation in this respect would, in the impossibility of sending their children abroad, be entailed upon the rising generation, if no institutions of learning were founded in their behalf. Therefore, steps were early taken in this direction. After some abortive efforts, it was chiefly through the Rev. James Blair, D.D., that William and Mary College was at length established in Virginia. He was made its first president. Buildings were erected after plans by Sir Christopher Wren, and the first 'commencement' was held in the year 1700. Tributary to this institution, a number of free schools, supported mostly by the planters, existed in various parishes. In some of these, the classics formed a part of the curriculum.

Church and State.—In a number of the provinces there was a direct and well-understood connection between the Church and State. In Virginia this was established and maintained by law. As elsewhere, this connection tended at times to benefit the State rather than the Church. As elsewhere, also, the civil authorities occasionally assumed improper control of strictly ecclesiastical and spiritual affairs or prerogatives, and very much hindered and annoyed the clergy. The method of support by public taxation was the one which prevailed in the colonies, being thought preferable to the tithe system of England. The tax-levy included the amount necessary for both religious and civil purposes. In parts of Congregational New England, Churchmen were decidedly in the minority, and felt keenly the hardship of this compulsory contribution to the maintenance of heresy and schism. Eventually, but only after hard struggles, special acts of exemption were passed in their interests. Even so, these were not infrequently evaded and set aside by the 'Standing Order.'

Hardships of Churchmen.—As Mr. Fiske remarks, 'The aim of the pilgrims was the construction of a theocratic

state which should be to them all that the theocracy of Moses, and Joshua, and Samuel had been to the Jews in the Old Testament days. In such a scheme there was no room for religious liberty as we understand it. The state they were to found was to consist of an united body of believers, and in it there was, apparently, no more room for heretics than there was in Rome or Madrid.'[1] Under their *régime*, Church and State were as closely connected as they were at that time in England. None were at liberty to worship publicly in any other way, or to hold civil offices unless they were members of some Congregational Church.[2] In 1746 Churchmen lost, by fresh legislation, the right to vote with their Congregational brethren in town meetings. In the protest which they made against this injustice, they were but anticipating the time when resistance to taxation without representation was to be the rallying force of a successful Revolution.[3] More consideration was subsequently shown to them when they had become numerous and formidable enough to form a third party, holding the balance of power between contending Congregationalists.

Unfairness to the Church.—Not a few instances occurred during this period in various parts of the country where the civil legislators endeavoured to dispossess the Church of a portion of her revenues, or to impress upon the clergy a new and unreasonable scale of pecuniary support. Such was their unfriendliness that at length, in some places, the clergy were for a while forbidden to assemble even for conference among themselves. As elsewhere, once more, this intolerance and injustice was, to a very large extent, the result of a combination between hostile dissenters and political agitators. So far as one can judge from documents now accessible, it would seem that there was but little, if indeed any, disposition on the part of Churchmen to retaliate, even in localities where they were unquestionably in the predominance.

[1] Fiske, *Beginnings of New England*, 146.

[2] Beardsley, *History of the Episcopal Church in Connecticut*, i. 8.

[3] *Annals of an Old Parish*, by the Rev. Edmund Guilbert, D.D., 10 *sqq.*

That such was their charitable policy may be inferred from the fact that, notwithstanding the manner in which their fellow-members were treated by the Puritans of New England, many of the latter came at intervals to Virginia. And, further, after an Act had been passed by the Maryland Assembly compelling everywhere the use of the Prayer Book in public worship, and remonstrances against its unfairness to others had been made, the Act was repealed. It is true that in this same Assembly shortly afterwards measures unjustly bearing upon the Roman Catholics were enacted; but this was the work not of Churchmen, but of the Independents or adherents of Parliament, the former having temporarily withdrawn from public affairs.

The Maryland Act of Toleration.—This may be the most opportune time for referring to the famous Act of Toleration passed first in Maryland, whereby all forms of the Christian religion were to be protected from proscription and persecution. The claim has been made frequently and continuously that the whole credit for this action is due to the Roman Catholics. But the records go to show that the majority of those responsible for it were members of the Church of England, and that it was they who really combined to protect and tolerate the others.

Persecution by Puritans.—It is not uncharitable to say that the motives of the Puritans (very many of whom stoutly maintained all the while that they still belonged to the Church of England) in migrating to America were by no means altogether unselfish and unworldly. Some of their settlements would appear to have been largely, if not chiefly, of a commercial character. Notwithstanding the fact that in some of their English charters the conversion to Christianity of the savages and heathens was stipulated as one of the main objects of such charters, they showed, upon their arrival in New England, but little regard for the spiritual welfare of these ignorant people. They were described by opprobrious epithets, and at times were cruelly assaulted and murdered. It may not be out of place to quote here a concise and witty statement on this point, generally attributed to the late

Bishop Williams of Connecticut: 'They first landed and fell upon their knees; then they arose and fell upon the aborigines.'

Puritanical Inconsistency.—The Puritans had no objections to an establishment *per se*; but it was to be one of their own devising, and for their own benefit exclusively. By formal enactment, an Order 'in Church and Commonwealth' was set up in Massachusetts and Connecticut. In the former state, it remained in law until 1834. It was not so much with them a question as to whether or not there should be any oppression on account of religious beliefs and customs as a question which party should have such a power.

There was hardly anything as to which they did not claim the right to exercise this power. They sometimes compelled 're-ordination by the brethren' when Anglican clergymen, wearied out with the strife and consulting their ease and pecuniary advantage, ministered to the Congregationalists. Easily-manufactured 'crimes' were laid to the charge of some who, in consequence, lost their ears, had their tongues bored with red-hot irons, were whipped, fined, starved, and even put to death.[1]

[1] Neal, *Puritans*, vol. i. p. 334.

CHAPTER II

THE FIRST PART OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

Advance in Evangelisation.—The beginning of the eighteenth century saw a distinct advance in the efforts made for the evangelisation of the Western Hemisphere. Bishop Compton of London (to which see all the American colonies had been attached) sent as his commissary for Maryland the Rev. Thomas Bray, D.D. He soon proved himself to be a man of unusual ability and zeal. He became familiar with the needs and prospects of the Church in these parts. Indeed, he was so impressed with them that, on his return to England in 1700-1, he set himself to organise and obtain a charter for what is so well known as the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. No language can be too strong by which American Churchmen would seek to express their sense of obligation to the now venerable Society for its continuous benefactions during well-nigh a century in the carrying out of its great designs.

The Rev. Dr. Bray and the S. P. G.—While Dr. Bray did not confine his interest and plans to the American colonies, yet it was primarily and chiefly for them that he inaugurated this particular movement—one which may be said to have grown out of earlier missionary efforts on his part, by which, in 1698, the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge had been formed.

The foreign branch of the designs of this latter Society was declared in the beginning to be 'the fixing Parochial Libraries throughout the Plantations, especially on the Continent of North America.'[1] This Society now

[1] Before the Rev. Dr. Bray's death, in 1730, nearly forty of

considered in earnest the petition of Dr. Bray and other papers, and advanced the money required to pay for the charter of the proposed new Society, to which expenses the Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Tenison) made the first donation of twenty guineas. In the Charter it is stated that 'in many of our Plantacons (*sic*) Colonies, and Factories beyond the Seas . . . the Provision for Ministers was very mean,' many others were 'wholly destitute, and unprovided of a Mainteynance for Ministers, and the Publick Worshipp of God, and for Lack of Support and Mainteynance for such' many seemed to be 'abandoned to Atheism and Infidelity.'[1]

The Religious Condition of New York.—When one considers the present condition and prospects as to growth and prosperity of the city of New York and its neighbourhood, one cannot but read with especial interest the account given in 1704 by Colonel Heathcote of the religious state of Westchester County, now a part of the metropolis. He writes of it as he found it when he first went there, twelve years before: 'I found it the most rude and Heathenish Country I ever saw in my whole Life, which called themselves Christians, there being not so much as the least marks or Footsteps of Religion of any sort. *Sundays* being the only time sett apart by them for all manner of vain sports and lewd Diversions, and they were grown to such a Degree of Rudeness that it was intollerable, and having then the command of the Militia, I sent an order to all the Captains, requiring their men under Arms, and to acquaint them, that in case they would not in any Town agree among themselves to appoint Readers and pass the Sabbath in the best manner they could, till such Times as they could be better provided, that they should every Sunday call their Companies under arms, and spend the Day in Exercise; whereupon it was unanimously agreed on thro' the

these libraries had been established in America alone. They were also set up in many parts of England and Wales, and afterwards in the British Colonies, until at present there are not less than three hundred of them in various parts of the world.

[1] See *A History of Saint Peter's Church in the City of Albany*, by the Rev. Joseph Hooper, M.A.

County, to make choice of Readers; which they accordingly did, and continued in those Methods for some Time.'

In 1701, while the population of the province was about 25,000, there appeared to be 'no Church of England in all Long Island, nor in all that great Continent of New York Province, except at New York Town.'

The plans and efforts in England on behalf of the foreign field had been desultory and isolated. And in the absence of personal contact with the ecclesiastical authorities at home, the clergy lacked *esprit de corps.* It was, therefore, felt that, for the benefit of all concerned, it was necessary that more united and systematic efforts should be put forth, and that the staff of labourers should be increased.

The Rev. George Keith and the Rev. John Talbot.—The Society very soon appointed the Rev. George Keith as its special envoy to inquire into the spiritual condition of the people, and to awaken, if possible, their religious sensibilities. The choice proved to be a particularly happy one, as Mr. Keith prosecuted his labours with great diligence and acceptableness, and was a very wise adviser of the Society. He had for a while the advantageous help of the Rev. John Talbot, who accompanied him on many of his journeys, which embraced New England, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, and North Carolina.

Keith's Journal.—In his journal, published after his return to England, he says: 'In all the places where we travelled and preached, we found the people well affected to the Doctrine which we preached among them, and they did generally join with us decently in the Liturgy and Public Prayers, and Administration of the Holy Sacraments, after the Usage of the Church of *England,* as we had occasion to use them. And where Ministers were wanting (as there were wanting in many places), the People earnestly desired us to present their Request to the *Honourable Society,* to send Ministers unto them, which accordingly I have done, and, in answer to their request, the Society has sent to such places as seemed most to want a considerable number of missionaries.'

In a letter written during his journeys (February 1703), he says: 'There is a mighty cry and desire almost in all places where we have travelled to have ministers of the Church of England sent to them in these Northern parts of America. . . . If they come not timely, the whole country will be overrun with Presbyterians, Anabaptists, and Quakers.' When Keith officiated at Hampsted (or Hempstead) on Sunday, September 27, 1702, there was 'such a multitude of people that the church would not hold them, so that many stood without at the doors and windows to hear, who were generally well affected, and greatly desired that a Church of England Minister should be settled among them.'

He baptized, among others, a justice of the peace and his family at Oyster Bay, where up to this time there had 'scarce been any profession of the Christian religion'; but there were many of 'Case's crew who set up a new sort of Quakerism. . . . Among other vile principles they condemned marriage, and said it was of the Devil.' They called themselves 'the Children of the Resurrection.' Of the people living in this same neighbourhood, the Rev. J. Thomas (missionary there, 1704–24) reports that they had been 'wholly unacquainted with the Blessed Sacrament for five-and-fifty years together,' and that many of them were 'intirely ignorant that Communion was a duty.'

To supplement the public services and sermons, books were distributed, schools were established, and week-day catechisings were instituted. Of the latter means, the Rev. G. Muirson—one of the most laborious and efficient clergymen of his period—says that, in connection with frequent visiting, he found that he made 'twice more proselytes than by public preaching.'

In their difficult tasks, the clergy of this time had valuable aid oftentimes from the colonial governors and other laymen. Among such as were thus helpful may be mentioned Colonel Morris, Colonel Heathcote, Colonel Dudley, General Nicholson, Governor Hunter, Sir William Johnson, and Mr. St. George Talbot.

Talbot's Report.—In September 1703, the Rev. Mr. Talbot writes: 'It is a sad thing to "consider the years

that are past" ; how some that were born of the English have never heard of the name of Christ; how many others were baptized in His name and have fallen away to Heathenism, Quakerism, and Atheism, for want of Confirmation. . . . The poor Church has nobody upon the spot to comfort or confirm her children ; nobody to ordain several that are willing to serve, were they authorised, for the work of the ministry. Therefore, they fall back again into the herd of the Dissenters, rather than they will be at the Hazard and Charge to goe as far as England for Orders : so that we have hardly an orthodox minister am'st them, which might have been supply'd, had we been so happy as to see a Bishop or Suffragan *apud Americanos.*'

Lapsing into Heathenism.—That this dread of nominal Christians lapsing into actual heathenism was no mere figure of speech is made the more evident by similar communications from other clergymen in various parts of the country. The Rev. S. Thomas, who went out in 1702 as the first missionary of the Society to South Carolina, writes that numbers of the English settlers were 'in such a wildness, and so destitute of spiritual guides and all the means of grace, that they were making near approach to that heathenism which is to be found among the negroes and Indians.' He persuaded the majority of the people to a better observance of the Lord's Day, which had been 'generally profaned,' and to family prayers, as to which they had been 'perfect strangers.'

Other Missionary Reports.—One of the Society's itinerant missionaries in Massachusetts, the Rev. J. Bailey, wrote that 'Industry, Morality, and Religion' were 'flourishing among a people till of late abandoned to disorder, vice, and profaneness.' The Rev. J. Adams wrote to the Society from North Carolina in October 1709: 'The abuses and contumelies I meet with in my own person are but small troubles to me in respect of that grief of hearing of the most sacred parts of Religion impiously profaned and rediculed. We had a Communion lately, and the looser sort at their drunken revellings and caballs, spare not to give about their bread and drink in the words of administration, to bring in contempt that most holy

Sacrament and in derision of those few good persons who then received it.' No wonder that from such a congregation he did not get enough support to 'pay for diet and lodging.'

Royal Instructions.—It will be interesting to note some of the royal instructions as given in 1703 to Lord Cornbury, afterwards Earl of Clarendon, and at that time governor of New York and New Jersey.

'60. You shall take especial care that God Almighty be devoutly and duly serv'd throughout your Government. The Book of Common Prayer as by Law established read each Sunday and Holy Day and the blessed Sacrament administer'd according to the rites of the Church of England. You shall be careful that the Churches already built there be well and orderly kept and that more be built as the Colony shall, by God's blessing, be improved, and that besides a competent maintenance to be assign'd the Minister of each Orthodox Church, a convenient House be built, at the common charge for each minister, and a competent proportion of lands be assign'd him for a glebe and exercise of his industry, and you are to take care that the parishes be so limited and settled as you shall find most convenient for the accomplishing this good work.'

The Rector's Rights.—As bearing upon later dissensions concerning the rector's rights as a member of the parochial organisation, it may be well to cite: '62. You are to give order forthwith (if the same be not already done) that every orthodox Minister within your government be one of the Vestry in his respective Parish, and that no Vestry be held without him, except in case of sickness, or that, after notice of a Vestry summoned, he omit to come.'

In those days, as in other days since, it was highly important and necessary to guard against impostors; hence the propriety of the following: '63. You are to enquire whether there be any minister within your Government who preaches and administers the Sacrament in any orthodox church or chapel without being in due orders, and to give an account thereof to the said Bishop of London.' It is noteworthy that sections 60 and 63

continued, almost *verbatim*, to form a part of the instructions issued to governors until nearly the middle of the nineteenth century.

The Early Clergy.—Intimations have been made occasionally that not all the clergy who came out to America were of exemplary character. In view of this almost unavoidable circumstance, it is pleasant to recall the testimony of so good a witness as Colonel Heathcote, who writes to the Society in 1705: 'I must do all the gentlemen that justice which you have sent to this province as to declare that a better clergy were never in any place, there being not one amongst them that has the least stain or blemish as to his life or conversation.' In 1711, Governor Hunter wrote from New York: 'Wee are happy in these provinces in a good sett of Missionarys, who generally labour hard in their functions and are men of good lives and ability.'

The Rev. William Vesey's Report.—The report made to the Society in 1745 by the Rev. William Vesey, its Commissary for New York and New Jersey, gives a concise and graphic description of the progress made by the Church at this period. After alluding to the time (1697) when he came as rector of Trinity Church, New York, he says: 'Besides this church and the chappel in the fort, one church in Philadelphia and one other in Boston, I don't remember to have heard of one Building erected for the publick worship of God according to the Liturgy of the Church of England in this Northern Continent of America from Maryland (where the Church was establisht by a Law of that Province) to the Eastern-most bounds of Nova Scotia, which I believe in length is 800 miles; and now most of these Provinces or Collonies have many Churches, which against all opposition increase and flourish under the miraculous influence of Heaven.'

'I make no doubt,' he continues, 'it will give a vast pleasure to the Honble. Society to observe the wonderfull Blessing of God on their pious Cares and Endeavours to promote the Christian Religion in these remote and dark Corners of the World, and the great Success that, by the concomitant power of the Holy Ghost, has attended the

faithful labours of their Missionarys, in the conversion of so many from vile Errors and wicked Practices to the Faith of Christ, and the Obedience to his Gospell.'

Work among Negroes and Indians.—Missionary work was in some parts needed more for the colonists than for the negroes and Indians; for it is literally true that many of the settlers lived 'worse than the heathen,' but the negroes and Indians were not overlooked. A care for their spiritual welfare had been enjoined upon such as received royal charters, and Manteo, an Indian chieftain, had been baptized in North Carolina as early as 1587.

John Eliot and the Indians.—The Rev. John Eliot, after a few years of labour among the whites of New England, devoted himself, beginning with the year 1646, almost exclusively to the Indians. Because of his zeal in their behalf, he well deserved the title given him by Thomas Thorowgood of 'the Indian Apostle.' He translated the Bible and several other books into their language, and learned to speak to them in their own tongue. It is said that he was the means, under God, of converting to Christianity not less than 3600 Indians. His hearers showed great willingness to receive the Gospel, and all the greater interest was taken by some in their conversion from the belief that they were the descendants of the lost tribes of Israel. When, because of his advanced age, he was too feeble to continue his active labours among them, he would assemble the negro servants and give them religious instruction; and a boy made blind by falling into the fire was taught by him to repeat a large part of the Bible. He was baptized in the Church, and his name is inserted by Neal in the list of the clergy who emigrated to America. Chiefly owing to his devotion and influence, philanthropic Englishmen, including a number of Dissenters, formed (in 1649) 'The President and Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in New England.' The ordinance by which this Society was formed was approved by the Protector, Oliver Cromwell. The Hon. Robert Boyle was its liberal patron. After the restoration, the Society received a new Charter, under the influence largely of Lord Chancellor Hyde and Richard Baxter,

and was then entitled 'The Society for the Propagation ot the Gospel in New England and parts adjacent.' Eliot appears to have been congregationally ordained as teacher of the first Church of Christ in Roxbury; and yet one would like to think Neal correct in his classification of him.

Opposition aroused.—Labours of a similar kind among the negroes in other parts of the country aroused not a little opposition. The Rev. Dr. Le Jau,[1] of Goosecreek, South Carolina, wrote under the date of August 18, 1711: '"What!" said a lady, considerable enough in any other respect but in that of sound knowledge, "is it possible that any of my slaves could go to heaven, and must I see them there?" A young gent had said some time before that he is resolved never to come to the holy table while slaves are received there.'

As time went on, the care of the Church for the Indians and the negroes became more general and more earnest; and yet this greater zeal on the part of some seemed to arouse all the greater enmity on the part of others. The Rev. J. Beach, writing in 1733 from Newtown, Massachusetts, says: 'When I first arrived here, I intended to visit the Indians who live three miles from Newtown, and I had hopes that some good might have been wrought upon them; but many of the English here that are bitter enemies to the Church, antidoted them against the Church, or any instructions they might have received from me, by insinuating them with a jealousy, if they received me as their minister, I would in time get their land from them, and they must be obliged to pay me a salary.

'This put them in a great Rage, for these Indians are a very jealous people, and particularly suspicious of being

[1] Francis Le Jau was a Canon of St. Paul's, London, who, in the beginning of his ministry, engaged very zealously in missionary work in St. Christopher's, Leeward Islands. Shortly after he began his labours in South Carolina, he mastered the Savannah language, in order to preach among the Indians. He also sent to the Society a translation into that tongue of the Lord's Prayer. He continued his faithful and efficient ministrations among the English, negroes, and Indians until his death in 1717.

cheated out of their land by the English (the English having got most of it from them already). These English Dissenters likewise railed against all the Churchmen in Generall, telling them (the Indians) they were rogues, etc., and advised them that if I came among them to instruct them, to whip me. In a word, they raised such a ferment among these Rude Barbarians, that their Sachem, or Chief, said that if I came among them, he would shoot a bullet thro' my heart: these things severall of the Indians have told me since. However, I, not knowing the danger, went to visit them, but they looked very surlily upon me, and showed a great uneasiness when I mentioned the name of God, so that I plainly saw, that they were resolved not to hear me, and I feared that if I had persisted in my discourse of Religion, that they would have done me a mischief.' This aversion to the English missionaries was, one grieves to say, partly owing to the Roman Catholic missionaries, who taught them, among other things, to extirpate the English because they cruelly murdered the Saviour of mankind.

At Stratford, Connecticut, the Rev. Dr. Johnson always had a catechetical lecture during the summer, which was largely attended by negroes. At Narragansett, Rhode Island, the Rev. Dr. MacSparran had a class of seventy Indians and negroes, to whom he gave regular instruction; and the Rev. J. Honyman of Newport, Rhode Island, had both in his congregation constantly, sometimes the negroes numbering as many as a hundred.

The duty of giving proper instruction to these two races was especially enjoined by the Society upon its missionaries and schoolmasters. In the province of New York, as many as sixteen clergymen and thirteen lay-readers were appointed, mainly to give such instruction. A 'Catechising School' especially for the benefit of the negroes was established in 1704 in the city of New York by Mr. Elias Neau, a native of France, who had suffered in various ways in France for his renunciation of the Roman faith. He conformed to the Church, and proved a worthy son, testimony in regard to his unselfish, diligent, and successful labours being borne to the Society by the most eminent civil dignitaries of the day.

Great circumspection was observed in presenting candidates for Baptism, and some of them would have put to the blush many of the more favoured white people. The Rev. S. Auchmuty of Trinity Church, New York, reported that 'not one single Black' that had been admitted by him to Holy Communion had 'turned out bad or been, in any shape, a disgrace to our holy Profession.'

While in many places there was much opposition to any endeavours in their behalf, as we have already noted, there was a growing consciousness of the Church's duty towards them. This found expression in a series of resolutions adopted in April 1710 by the Society:—

'1. That the design of propagating the Gospel in foreign parts does chiefly and principally relate to the conversion of heathens and infidels; and therefore that branch of it ought to be prosecuted preferably to all others.

'2. That in consequence thereof, immediate care be taken to send itinerant Missionaries to preach the Gospel amongst the Six Nations of the Indians, according to the primary intentions of the late King William of glorious memory.

'3. That a stop be put to the sending any more Missionaries among Christians, except to such places where Ministers are or shall be dead, or removed, and unless it may consist with the funds of the Society to prosecute such designs.'

In some parishes, there would seem to have been no feeling of caste, the white and black catechumens meeting together for instruction.

Inconsistencies of Christians.—One of the chief obstacles in the way of converting the Indians was the same which so greatly impedes missionary labours among heathen people to-day—the inconsistencies of those who profess to be Christians. The Rev. G. Muirson, writing as to the Indians from Rye, New York, in 1708, says: 'We have not now in all this parish 20 Families, whereas not many years agoe there were several Hundreds. I have frequently conversed with some of them, and bin at their great meetings of *pawawing* as they call it. I have

taken some pains to teach some of them but to no purpose, for they seem regardless of Instruction—and when I have told them of the evil consequences of their hard drinking &c. they replyed that Englishmen do the same: and that it is not so great a sin in an Indian as in an Englishman, because the Englishman's Religion forbids it, but an Indian's does not. They further say that they will not be Christians, nor do they see the necessity for so being, because we do not live according to the precepts of our religion; in such ways do most of the Indians that I have conversed with either here or elsewhere express themselves. I am heartily sorry that we shou'd give them such a bad example and fill their mouths with such objections against our blessed Religion.'

CHAPTER III

THE CHURCH AND THE WESLEYS

The Enmity of Puritans.—The variety of Dissent with which the Church had to contend during these days in New England may be inferred from a letter of the Rev. Mr. Fayerweather, at Narragansett, who writes of having his dwelling 'in the midst of enemies, Quakers, Anabaptists, Antipædobaptists, Presbyterians, Independents, Dippers, Levellers, Sabbatarians, Muggletonians, and Brownists.' These united 'in nothing but pulling down the Church of England, which they call emphatically Babel, a synagogue of Satan,' etc. They said that the sign of the Cross was the mark of the beast and the sign of the devil, and that those who received it were given to the devil. Sometimes they would forcibly enter the churches and despoil them of their ornaments, vestments, and books.

Under these trying circumstances, it was by no means an easy thing for the missionaries to obey the instructions which the Society gave them, to the effect that they should be mild, peaceable, and forbearing.

John Checkley.—No Churchman, perhaps, in New England was more persistently and unjustly persecuted than John Checkley. His active and influential championship of the Church's doctrines and of the rights of her members, during a period of over twenty years (1720-1742), and the sturdy manner in which he resisted the many attempts to silence and punish him, easily marked him out as a peculiarly fitting object of Puritan enmity. He was ordained both deacon and priest on the same day in May 1738. He ministered with much acceptance to congregations in Providence, Rhode Island, and Taunton,

Massachusetts, comprising Indians as well as white people. To the former he preached in their own tongue. He also occupied himself in giving theological instruction to such young men as from time to time were put under his care.[1]

The Enmity of Quakers.—In Pennsylvania, a less cruel but, in its way, an equally determined opposition, was manifested by the Quakers, who sought to intimidate people from attending churches and parochial schools, sometimes even seeking, in their enmity to the Church, the alliance of Roman Catholics, and themselves joining in this crusade the already enraged Deists and Jacobites. One of the early rectors of Chester, the Rev. Richard Backhouse, declared that he was 'hunted as a wild beast, to be run down or drove away.'

The Rev. George Ross, another rector of the same parish,[2] writing to the Society under date of January 22, 1711-12, says: 'The number of those who profess themselves members of our Church is but small in comparison of the mischievous brood of Quakers here. The seeds of Apostasy have taken deep root, and that fatal Weed of Quakerism is cultivated with the utmost skill and tenderness, so that it is not likely to fade all of a sudden. This novelty is so fashionable and prevailing in this place that some of those who own themselves Churchpeople are strangely bewitched and lull'd into an indifferency about the baptism of their Infants, and notwithstanding what I could offer both in public and in private to cure this infection, yet I cannot say that I have succeeded so well as might be reasonably expected.'

The Rev. T. Crawford, after serving for two years at Dover, Delaware, writes in 1706: 'At my first comeing I found the people all stuffed with various opinions, but not one in the place that was so much of a Churchman as to stand Godfather for a child; so that I was two

[1] See an admirable monograph in two volumes published in 1897 by the Prince Society, Boston, entitled *John Checkley; or the Evolution of Religious Toleration in Massachusetts Bay*, with a Memoir by the Rev. Edmund F. Slafter, D.D.

[2] He was also rector for some time of New Castle, Delaware, where he was buried.

months in the place before I baptized any, on that account . . . but now (I thank God) I have baptized a great number, they bring their children with sureties very orderly to the Church; and also people at age a great many, the greater part whereof were Quakers and Quaker children; for by God's blessing upon my labours I have not only gained the hearts of my hearers, but some that were my greatest enemies at first and Quakers that were fully resolved against me are come over and have joyned themselves to our Communion. I have baptized families of them together, so I have dayly additions to the congregation.'

Gratitude of Colonists.—While in not a few cases the bounty of the Society and of others was but poorly appreciated and requited, yet in not a few, again, much gratitude was expressed. Thus, the 'Vestry of Queen Anne's Creek,' on 'behalfe of the rest of the inhabitants of the precinct' of Chowan, wrote in 1714: 'Wee . . . in a most gratefull manner Return our hearty thanks to the Honble. Society etc. for their great Care of our Souls' health in sending over Missionaries to preach the Word of God, and administering the Holy Sacrament among us. Wee and the whole English America ought to bless and praise the Almighty for having putt it into the hearts of so many and great Honble. Personages to think of their poor Country Folk whose lott it hath been to come into these Heathen Countries where we were in danger of becoming like the Indians themselves, without a God in the world.'

The New England Converts.—A remarkable instance of the attraction exercised by the Church in the midst of her enemies is afforded by the story of the New England converts of 1722. In that year Connecticut was thrown into excitement by the news that seven prominent members of Yale College, all of them Presbyterians or Congregationalists, had submitted to the teaching of the Church. Among them was Timothy Cutler, the President of the College, and two of its tutors, Samuel Johnson and Daniel Brown. They had been accustomed to meet together and to discuss the claims of Episcopacy. They studied the Prayer Book and then went on to study the great

masters of Anglican theology. Slowly the little band became convinced. The result was that on September 13, 1722, they met the trustees of the College in the college library, and read an honourable statement of their belief. The three leaders sailed for England, where they received holy orders. They returned to America, where Cutler became Rector of Christ Church, Boston, and Johnson Rector of Stamford, Connecticut. Their work was blessed with great success, and in spite of the fact that three of the original seven recanted, their places were more than filled by other converts from Yale.

The Rev. Dr. MacSparran and Rural New England.—The recent publication of the *Diary* (1743-51) of the Rev. James MacSparran, D.D., rector of Narragansett from 1721 to 1757, enables one to form a tolerably correct view of the daily life of a New England clergyman of that period.[1] It is a recital of many services and baptisms, of pastoral visits, of generous hospitality, of controversies and bickerings, the sowing and gathering of crops, and many homely events—all helping to give us a graphic picture of what rural Rhode Island was a century and a half ago. Dr. MacSparran was mindful not only of the needs of the white people about him, but was equally faithful in his ministrations to the negroes and Indians. Stimulated, no doubt, to zeal in behalf of the latter by the enthusiasm enkindled in him by Berkeley (Dean of Derry, and subsequently Bishop of Cloyne, who paid him a visit in 1729), he at one time planned the founding of a college for them; and a beautiful tract of land not far from his residence is still known as the 'College Reservation.' He appears to have had a great aversion to lay-readers, who in those days, when clergymen were so few and far between, were deemed almost essential in some places to the maintenance of regular services. The following is a part of his entry under date of Sunday, August 4, 1751.

Aversion to Lay Readers.—'I read Prayers, and preached from Heb. v. 4, ag't unordained Teachers, *precipue* Lay Readers in our Ch'ch.' The title of this discourse was,

[1] *The MacSparran Diary*, etc., by the Rev. Daniel Goodwin, Ph.D.

'The Enormity of Lay Reading.' On another day in the same year, he writes: 'Col. Updike came to breakfast y^s^ morning from Tower hill, where he had been filing Declarations. He told us a surprizing Piece of news, but of a Piece w^th^ other late Proceedings of y^e^ Rhode Island ch^h^men, vis^t^. y^t^ y^e^ young Peter Bourse read prayers and preached in y^e^ c^hh^ there last Sunday, w^tht^ any kind of ordination. May God open y^t^ young man's eyes y^t^ he may see y^t^ he has transgressed against y^e^ Lord in offering Publick Prayers w^ch^ is y^e^ same in y^e^ X^n^ C^hh^, y^t^ offering Incense on y^e^ Altar was in y^e^ Jewish. Uzziah was thrust out of y^e^ Sanctuary for such a Desecration w^ch^ turned to his Dishonour, he became a Leper to his dying Day.' A few days after, he returns to the subject: 'Mr. Usher who had officiated y^e^ Day before at Newport came here. By him I understand y^t^ Peter Bourse's officiating is disliked by many, and will breed Disturbance. God guard my ch^h^ against y^e^ Inroads of Lay Readers.'[1]

Encounter with Dissenter.—Dr. MacSparran was a man of uncommon ability, and was held to the last in the highest esteem by those who knew him. It is thought that to him it is largely due that Bishop Seabury was in his youth trained in Churchly ways. He was not only opposed to lay-readers, but also to all religious teachers outside of the Church. One day he passed on horseback a lowly Quaker, who was reckoned a rather remarkable preacher, laying a stone wall by the roadside, and stopping his horse, said rather pompously, 'Well, James, how many barrels of pudding and milk will it take to make fifty roads of stone wall?' The reply came very promptly: 'Just as many as it will take of *hireling priests* to make one *Gospel minister*.'

Itinerant Missionaries.—Mention has been made of itinerant missionaries. These were well-nigh, if not quite, essential because of the immense tracts of but

[1] Mr. Bourse was the son of one of the most influential citizens of Newport, was a graduate of Harvard College, and afterwards rector of Marblehead, Massachusetts. It is interesting to note that Dr. MacSparran's successor, the Rev. Mr. Fayerweather, was subsequently married to the widow of this same Mr. Bourse.

poorly developed country which they had to cover in their ministrations, and of the very meagre, indeed quite insufficient, stipends offered them in any one parish.

Occasionally the practice of apostolic days[1] was revived; as, for example, when, in 1743, a magistrate from North Carolina arrived in London with letters to the Society from prominent laymen, endorsed by the few clergymen there, testifying that the bearer, Clement Hall, was of 'very good repute, life, and conversation.' In his after-conduct as a clergyman, serving for twelve years on an annual stipend of £30, he amply verified the encomium passed upon him. He had exclusive charge of hundreds of miles, gathering some of his large congregations under the shade of the forest-trees. His own account of his labours, as given in the year 1752, is most interesting: 'I have now, through God's gracious Assistance and Blessing, in about seven or eight years, tho' frequently visited with sickness, been enabled to perform (for ought I know) as great Ministerial Duties as any Clergyman in North America: viz. to Journey about 14,000 miles, Preach about 675 Sermons, Baptize about 5783 White Children, 243 Black Children, 57 White Adults, and 112 Black Adults—in all, 6195 Persons; sometimes admin'r the Holy Sacra't of ye Ld's Supper to 2 or 300 Communicants, in one Journey, besides Churching of Women, Visiting the sick &c. &c. I have reason to believe that my Health and Constitution is much Impair'd and Broken, by reason of my contin'd labours in my Office, and also from the Injurious treatment I have often rec'd from the adversaries of our Church and Constitution; for w'ch I do, and pray God to forgive them, and turn their hearts.'

John Wesley and Georgia.—The work during this period in Georgia has about it an especial interest because of Wesley's relation to it. Georgia was colonised in the beginning chiefly by the efforts of General James Oglethorpe, whose philanthropic heart was moved to obtain a charter in behalf of poor English families and of the Protestants exiled because of their religion from Germany. The first company of emigrants was accompanied by the

[1] See Acts vi. 3.

Rev. Henry Herbert, D.D., who only remained for three months, his health failing him in the meanwhile. He was followed by the Rev. Samuel Quincy, and he, in turn, by the Rev. John Wesley, whose appointment was made at a meeting of the Society held on January 17, 1736, at which, among others, were present the Bishops of London, Lichfield and Coventry, Rochester, and Gloucester. The minute is as follows: 'A memorial of the trustees for establishing the Colony of Georgia in America was read, setting forth that the Rev. Mr. Samuel Quincy, to whom the Society had been pleased, upon their recommendation, to allow a salary of fifty pounds per annum, has by letter certified to the said trustees that he is desirous of leaving the said Colony of Georgia, and returning home to England in the month of March next, to which they have agreed: and the said trustees recommend the Rev. Mr. John Wesley to the Society, that they would allow to him the said fifty pounds p. annum from the time Mr. Quincy shall leave the said colony, in the same manner as Mr. Quincy had it. Agreed that the Society do approve of Mr. Wesley as a proper person to be a missionary at Georgia, and that fifty pounds per annum be allowed to Mr. Wesley from the time Mr. Quincy's salary shall cease.'

His first design, as he wrote to the Society under date of July 26, 1737, 'was to receive nothing of any man but food to eat and rayment to put on, and those in kind only, that he might avoid, as far as in him lay, worldly desires and worldly cares; but being afterwards convinced by his friends that he ought to consider the necessities of his flock, as well as his own, he thankfully accepted that bounty of the Society, which he needed not for his own personal subsistence.'

His Difficulties and Labours.—Upon reaching his new field, Wesley found a very lax state of morals, and felt it necessary to institute a very strict system of discipline. He baptized children by immersion, allowed communicants only to act as their sponsors, refused the Holy Communion to unreconciled Dissenters, and would not read the Burial Service over the unbaptized.

His Sundays were fully occupied, as will appear from

his own Journal. 'Sunday, Oct. 30th, 1737. The first English prayers lasted from five to half-past six. The Italian, which I read to a few Vaudois, began at nine. The second service for the English (including the Sermon and the Holy Communion) continued from half an hour past ten to half an hour past twelve. The French service began at one. At two I catechised the children. About three, I began the English service. After this was ended, I had the happiness of joining with as many as my largest room would hold in reading, prayer, and singing praise; and about six the service of the Moravians, so called, began, at which I was glad to be present, not as a teacher, but a learner.'

Accusations against Wesley.—It was not likely that he could impose his severe discipline upon such a community as he found without exciting opposition, and even enmity. He was accused of many things which were very bad in their eyes—formalism, hypocrisy, a secret liking for the Roman Church. They sought to substantiate this last charge by referring to his efforts to introduce auricular confession and penance. Matters were brought to a crisis by his course towards a lady with whom at one time he was in love, but who afterwards married a Mr. Williamson. He publicly rebuked her, and subsequently warned her not to come to the Holy Communion. Her husband began a suit against him for defaming her character. This charge he denied before the magistrates, whom he reproved for undertaking, as a purely secular court, to deal with matters strictly ecclesiastical. The grand jury found—not unanimously, however—a true bill against him, in which they traversed the whole ground of the common complaints as to 'deviations from the principles and regulations of the Established Church.' Wesley was now fairly confronted in open court with his accusers; but many of his followers were alienated from him, and he finally set sail for England despite the efforts of the magistrates to prevent his doing so. He thus records his departure on December 2, 1737: 'Being now only a prisoner at large, in a place where I knew, by experience, every day would give fresh opportunity to procure

evidence of words I never used, and actions I never did, I saw clearly the hour was come for leaving this place; and as soon as evening prayers were over, about eight o'clock, the tide then serving, I shook off the dust of my feet and left Georgia, after having preached the Gospel there (not as I ought, but as I was able) one year and nearly nine months.' Christ Church, Savannah, was the only American parish which he ever had, although he occasionally officiated in a number of other places.

Charles Wesley.—Charles Wesley ministered in the same city, but only remained there four months. While he laboured earnestly, yet, from what it would seem was a lack of discretion on his part—particularly in the very literal interpretation of rubrics—he became so obnoxious to Oglethorpe and other influential persons, that he felt it to be more prudent to return to England. In one of his letters he thus describes his lot: 'I could not be more trampled upon were I a fallen minister of state. My few well-wishers are afraid to speak to me; the servant that used to wash my linen sent it back unwashed. Thanks be to God! it is not yet made a capital offence to give me a morsel of bread.'

George Whitefield.—In the spring following John Wesley's departure from Georgia, George Whitefield reached Savannah, largely moved thereto by Wesley's appeals for help, and hoping to labour with him. Far from having been appointed by the Society, to whom he offered his services, his name is only found in the record as connected with the assaults which he frequently made upon its missionaries. After preaching in Georgia for some months, he returned to England for priest's orders, and in quest of funds for a proposed American asylum for orphans. Between the intervals of several other visits to his native land, he travelled over a considerable part of the American colonies, attracting at times large congregations; but, so far as one can judge from impartial contemporaries, doing, in the long-run, more harm than good to the Church. He was more than eccentric. He ridiculed prominent clergymen, refused to wear the surplice and gown, admonished his hearers to attend, in his absence, the Presbyterian and Anabaptist

meetings. One of the Society's missionaries describes him as 'this strolling preacher with a musical voice, agreeable delivery, and a Brazen Forehead. . . . This deceiver pretends to be the only true minister of the Church of England now in America, and yet he has a criminal regard for all those who have ever been her avowed enemies.' The Rev. Alexander Garden, as Commissary, cited him to appear before the Ecclesiastical Court, to answer for his irregularities, and in published sermons and letters warned the people against his errors of doctrine, especially as to Regeneration and the work of the Holy Spirit.

Distrust of Him.—It is a fact not generally mentioned in the lives of Whitefield, that at one time he had a plan by which the whole body of Congregational ministers—whom he deemed 'unconverted'—were to be dismissed from their several congregations, and their places taken by those whom he should import from Great Britain. He took Dr. Edwards into his confidence; but as soon as President Clap heard of the scheme, he exposed and severely denounced it, and this was the means of widening a division already existing between the Old and New Lights of the day. The New Haven Association of Congregationalists issued a Declaration in 1744-5, which after giving sundry reasons why they did not care 'to improve (*sic*) the Rev. Mr. Whitefield,' concludes as follows: 'Nor can we reconcile his conduct and practice in publicly praying and administering the Sacrament among Presbyterians and Congregationalists in the extempore way, with his subscription and solemn promises and vows at the time of his Episcopal ordination; nor see how his doing so is consistent with moral honesty, Christian simplicity, and godly sincerity.' Other evidence might easily be given to show that it was not only from the Church clergy that he encountered opposition.

His Attachment to the Church.—Notwithstanding his consorting with and publicly ministering among Dissenters, he always, to the very time of his death, declared that he was in communion with and belonged to the English Church. By some unaccountable happening, he was buried (in gown, cassock, and bands) in a vault

under the pulpit of what is known as the 'Old South Presbyterian Church,' Newburyport, Massachusetts, where his bones are still shown with something like superstitious reverence. A few years ago, one of his admirers stole away to England with a part of a bone, which was subsequently returned, with some words of remorseful apology. As evidencing his attachment to the Church, the following extract (one only out of many similar ones that could be made) is from his Diary: 'Sunday, July 22. Went to St. Paul's and received the Blessed Sacrament, and preached in the evening at Kennington Common to about 30,000 hearers. . . . I wish that the Church of England were the joy of the whole earth.'

CHAPTER IV

BISHOPS AND INDEPENDENCE

The Church's two great Impediments.—The Church in all these parts had two other and very serious impediments in the way of her growth. One was ecclesiastical, one was political. The first had to do with the ever-growing want of the Episcopate. The second had to do with the increasing disaffection, as to civil affairs, towards the mother-country.

The course of the former was longer and wider than that of the latter. It began almost immediately upon the settlements along the Atlantic coast. Although the new lands had been put under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of London, his connection with them was only nominal. In the very nature of the case, it could be but little better. The injustice done the Church in America by this arrangement was patent to all serious-minded Churchmen. Archbishop Laud was so impressed with it that he is said to have advocated even a resort to arms, if necessary, to secure a local Episcopate. During the reign of Charles II., so much interest was felt in the matter that a patent was actually made out for the consecration of the Rev. Dr. Alexander Murray. Delays, arising chiefly from pecuniary considerations, ensued, and his consecration was deferred. By reason of changes in monarchs and ministries, this urgent need was so overlooked that nothing had been accomplished, practically, when the eighteenth century began its new stories of great and enlarging embarrassments experienced for want of this essential feature of a branch of the Catholic Church.

Memorials concerning this want to the S. P. G.—The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts became at once a very proper channel through which communications upon the subject might be conveyed to the ecclesiastical and civil authorities at home. Accordingly, numerous memorials were thus transmitted from both clergymen and laymen; and frequently in the course of their customary letters the missionaries gave expression in earnest language to the deeply-felt concern of all loyal Churchmen as to the anomalous, because acephalous, condition in which they found themselves. The common request was that at least a suffragan should be sent 'to visit the several churches, ordain some, confirm others, and bless all.'

The Rev. Hugh Neill's Letter.—A quotation from a letter of the Rev. Hugh Neill of Oxford, Pennsylvania, will give a fair idea of the appeals so constantly and fervently made to the Society. He had been a Presbyterian minister before conforming to the Church, and had educated a nephew who had lost his life in a shipwreck while on his way to his ordination in England. He writes thus on May 19, 1766: 'Such, alas! are the misfortunes, and I may say, persecutions that attend the poor distress'd Church of England in America, that whilst the Dissenters can send out an innumerable tribe of teachers of all sorts without any expences, we must send them three thousand miles cross the Atlantic Ocean, at the expence of all we are worth, sometimes, and as much more as we have credit for, as well as the risque of our lives, before we can have an ordination—this is a difficulty that has, and always will, prevent the growth of the Church in America. Few Englishmen that can live at home will undertake the Mission—the great expences and dangers of the Seas that the Americans must encounter with, before they can obtain an ordination, damps their spirits, and forces many of them (who have strong inclinations to the Church) to join the Dissenters, and become teachers among them—thus when a vacancy happens among them, it can be filled in an instant, when a vacancy among us is some considerable time before they can have a minister. All this time the Dissenters

are making such havock among the Church people, that when a Missionary comes to one of these destitute places, he has all the work to begin again and many years before he can collect his scattered sheep. . . . The Dissenters very well know that the sending a Bishop to America, would contribute more to the Encrease of the Church here than all the money that has been raised by the Venerable Society. . . . Alas! we see and feel the power of our enemies and weakness of our friends, and can only mourn in secret and pray for better times.'

Sympathy of Dissenters.—While Dissenters of the more unfriendly sort congratulated themselves upon the evident disadvantages to the Church thus ensuing, others were quite outspoken in favour of Episcopacy, and actually desired its introduction into America, even in some instances among themselves. The Virginia Baptists, in an Association which met in 1774, declared their belief that apostles were officers that still appertained to the Church of Christ, and proceeded to set apart, by the imposition of hands, three of their ministers for this office. It does not appear that they long continued this provision.

Overtures from Lutherans.—The German Lutherans about this time more than once proposed that they should unite with the Church, upon the understanding that their ministers should receive episcopal ordination. A large congregation of Dutch Calvinists in Philadelphia made a similar proposal. The Lutheran Consistory of New York in 1797 declared that they did not look upon persons not yet communicants of a Lutheran Church as apostates in case they should join an English Episcopalian Church, and went on to say that they would never acknowledge a new-created Lutheran Church, merely English, in places where members could attend the services of the Episcopal Church.[1] The Rev. Dr. Allison, the most prominent Presbyterian divine in Pennsylvania, said that he would be quite content to see a bishop in every American province, provided that no civil power was annexed to the office. Many Quakers favoured the

[1] See *History of the Church of Zion and St. Timothy, New York*, by David Clarkson, pp. 5, 6.

idea, not so much out of regard for the office or for the Church as from a feeling that by this means a check would be given to the growth of Presbyterianism, which, for some reason, was particularly objectionable to them.

Sympathy in England.—The blame for the very long delay in securing bishops has been laid by many persons wholly upon the mother-church of England. Reference has already been made to the sympathy of many there with this project. Queen Anne[1] entered heartily into a scheme for the foundation of four bishoprics—two for the American continent and two for the islands. Archbishop Secker was much interested in the same scheme, towards whose realisation many and generous gifts were made. Archbishop Tenison bequeathed £1000 for this same object. Early in the reign of George I., the Propagation Society submitted a plan which included the establishment of one see at Burlington, New Jersey, and of another at Williamsburg, Virginia. Bishop Sherlock of London made subsequent efforts of a like kind, and became so much interested in the religious welfare of the colonies that he declined the patent from the Crown by which they were put in his charge, feeling that it was but a mere formality, and that his acquiescence in it might delay some better provision for their needs.

Want of Unanimity in America.—As further relieving the home authorities of at least a part of the blame attached to this weary waiting for bishops, one is bound to acknowledge that there was not entire unanimity among American Churchmen themselves. Some of the clergy even refused to join in petitions for the episcopate; partly, no doubt, from a dread of the discipline which would thereby be introduced. There were also some, both clergymen and laymen, who imagined that such a step would involve undesirable political changes and complications with Dissenters; that greater financial burdens would be imposed upon them; that the bishops

[1] This good Queen's name is reverently associated in a number of American parishes with gifts from her of altar-vessels, etc., still in use. In St. Anne's Church, Middletown, Delaware, there is carefully preserved a portion of an altar-cloth with the initials 'A. R.,' said to have been worked by the Queen herself.

would claim prerogatives hitherto enjoyed by others; and that they would set up establishments more or less of that pomp and ceremony already so distasteful to those who had been leading a simple colonist's life. It is not surprising that, under such circumstances, there should have been wanting a degree of that enthusiasm which otherwise one might have confidently anticipated. Had there been more of spiritual fervour, both in England and America, there would, doubtless, have been less of delay in a matter of such evident and growing necessity.

Alleged Consecration of Welton and Talbot.—While these various negotiations were pending, it is said that two priests were consecrated in England as bishops for America. The first was Robert Welton, rector of Whitechapel, London, who is reported by some to have been consecrated in 1722 by Ralph Taylor, who had himself been consecrated by three of the non-juring bishops—Spinckes, Hawes, and Gandy. Taylor and Welton are supposed to have consecrated Talbot, the rector of Burlington, New Jersey, in the same year. These two clergymen came to America, the latter returning to Burlington, and the former becoming rector of Christ Church, Philadelphia. There may be room for the doubt still felt as to their consecration, and there is but little presumption in favour of their having officiated as bishops. If so, it was but occasionally and privily.

In this connection, an extract may be made from a letter addressed to the Bishop of London by the Rev. Philip Stubs, secretary of the S. P. G., under date of April 16, 1725, as follows:—

'In obedience to your Lordship's commands just now laid upon me in the Cockpit, I dispatch as ordered by Sir J. Philips two paragraphs of a letter just came to hand, signed J^{n} Urmston[1] & dated Cecil County in Maryland 7^{ber} 29th, 1724.

'*P.S.*—Mr. Talbot did me no diskindness in causing

[1] This same Urmston is described by Peter Evans, high sheriff of Philadelphia, in a memorial to the Bishop of London, as bearing a decidedly bad reputation. See *Papers relating to the History of the Church in Pennsylvania*, by the Right Rev. William S. Perry, pp. 141, 142.

me to be turned out of Philadelphia to make room for himself. He convened all the Clergy to meet, *put on his robes & demanded Episcopal obedience from them.* One wiser than the rest refused, acquainted the Gov^r with the ill consequences thereof, the danger he would run of losing his Gov^mt, whereupon the Gov^r ordered the Church to be shut up.

'*P.S.*—He is succeeded by Dr. Welton, who makes a great noise amongst them by reason of his sufferings. He has brought with him to the value of £300 St: in Guns and fishing tackle, with divers printed copies of his famous Altar-piece at White chapel; he has added a scroll with words proceeding out of the mouth of the Bp. of Peterborough,[1] to this effect as I am told, "I am not he that betrayed X^t tho' as ready to do it as ever Judas was." I met him since in the streets, but had no further conversation with him.'

Election of Seabury.—It was not long after the reception of the articles of peace which definitely established the United States as a free and independent government, that ten out of the fourteen clergymen belonging to Connecticut assembled at Woodbury on the Feast of the Annunciation, 1783, to confer together as to the responsibilities of the Church under the new order of affairs. It can readily be understood that the most important and absorbing questions discussed had to do with the securing of a bishop as soon as possible. The clergyman finally chosen for the office was the Rev. Samuel Seabury, D.D., at that time serving as chaplain of the Provincial Hospital, New York, and also chaplain to the King's American Regiment. He had previously been rector (1757-66) of Jamaica and (1766-75) of Westchester, both in New York. His eminent abilities and force of character had already made him one of the most prominent and influential clergymen of his day, and he was at once recognised as one having pre-eminently the necessary qualifications for the episcopate.

Delays in his Consecration.—Early in July 1783, Seabury landed in London, carrying with him memorials

[1] The Right Rev. Robert Clavering.

from the clergy of Connecticut addressed to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, in which, after a statement of the case, an earnest appeal was made for his immediate consecration. He found the archbishops already more than favourable to the scheme, and they were fully persuaded of his character and attainments. Various political hindrances, however, were in the way, and there was lacking sufficient assurance of financial support.

The matter was under discussion and investigation more or less for over a year, during the whole of which period Seabury conducted himself admirably, endeavouring as best he could to accomplish his mission, but without any sacrifice of principle and self-respect.

Goes to Scotland.—At length, it appeared to him that the time had arrived when he should proceed to carry out another part of the instructions which he had received before leaving America, imposing upon him the duty of seeking consecration in Scotland, in the event of its being too long denied him in England.

Accordingly, he repaired to the former country, having already received from the prelates there an intimation of their readiness, under certain conditions, to grant his desire. In persuading them to this decision, the Rev. Dr. George Berkeley (son of the famous Bishop of Cloyne) and the Rev. Dr. Routh of Magdalen College, Oxford, bore a prominent part. No opposition to the course was manifested in England.

His Consecration there.—It was on Sunday, November 14, 1784, that Seabury was consecrated at Aberdeen, in the chapel belonging to Bishop Skinner, with whom were associated in this momentous occurrence Robert Kilgour, the Primus and Bishop of Aberdeen (Bishop Skinner being his coadjutor), and Arthur Petrie, Bishop of Moray and Ross. The non-juring bishops and other clergymen were still subject to penalties in the matter of public worship; but these were now seldom enforced. This service was publicly performed, amid a considerable congregation of both clergymen and laymen, all of whom expressed their great satisfaction and sympathy.

The Concordat.—A Concordat with the Scotch Bishops was made by Bishop Seabury, in which he promised that,

if the Scottish Eucharistic Service was found to be 'agreeable to the genuine Standards of Antiquity,' he would do what he could to have it introduced into the American Prayer-Book. This promise was fulfilled, with the result that to-day the two Eucharistic Services are very similar. The chief point of resemblance is the incorporation of the Oblation and Invocation with the Prayer of Consecration.

Relations with the Church of England.—The relations, necessarily more intimate, into which he had entered with the Church in Scotland had not in any way weakened the veneration and affection of Bishop Seabury and others for the English Church. In a letter which he wrote after his consecration to the Rev. Jonathan Boucher, he said: 'My own inclination is to cultivate as close a connection and union with the Church of England as that Church and the political state of the two countries shall permit.'

This reference to the political state of the two countries brings us to a consideration of the other of the two serious impediments in the way of Church growth mentioned in the beginning of this chapter.

Many of the clergy felt themselves to be especially embarrassed. They had learned to love their adopted country, and were very anxious for its prosperity; and yet they were under obligations of loyalty to their native land and its rulers. Nor could they fail to discern, amidst much that was really patriotic, traces of self-aggrandising propensities in the violent speeches and measures emanating from some of their parishioners. To maintain a strictly neutral position was very difficult, in some places impossible.

Personal and Practical Difficulties. Persecutions.—In addition to these difficulties, there were others of a more directly personal or practical character. Stipends were reduced, and bodily persecutions were by no means uncommon. The Tory clergy were stoned, ducked in water, imprisoned, threatened with death. In one instance, at least, they were stripped, tied to trees, and whipped. Cruelties were practised upon even the beasts belonging to such as were opposed to the Revolution. The Rev. Mr. Bailey, a missionary in Maine, writes:

'My Presbyterian neighbours were so zealous for the good of their country that they killed seven of my sheep out of seven, and shot a fine heifer as she was feeding in my pasture.' Some churches were used as stables for the Continental forces, organ-pipes were converted into bullets, and altar-vessels stolen and desecrated. At Fort Hunter, New York, a barrel of rum was placed in the reading-desk, and the building was used for a while as a tavern.

Many Allies of the Independence Cause.—Pamphlets were numerous; and many of the clergy (notably Dr. Seabury, the future bishop) took their share in this method of controversy. Large numbers of the clergy and laity allied themselves publicly and bravely with the cause of Independence. Indeed, the first movements in this direction proceeded from Churchmen. Among these, were Bass and Parker, both of whom were afterwards Bishops of Massachusetts; Provoost, afterwards Bishop of New York; Madison, the first Bishop of Virginia; Croes, the first Bishop of New Jersey; and Robert Smith, the first Bishop of South Carolina. A number of other clergymen were found in the army, either as officers or privates; nearly all of them, however, before taking Holy Orders. In South Carolina, it is said that three-fourths of the clergy favoured the Revolution.

Position of the Laity.—While the laity were at times much perplexed as to their duty in the premisses, they were, as a rule, much freer than the clergy to make their decision. So many of them threw in their lot with the revolutionists, that Dr. Joseph Warren, himself among the most ardent of them, declared that 'the gentlemen of the Established Church are men of the most just and liberal sentiments, and are high in the esteem of the most sensible and resolute defenders of the rights of the people of this continent.'

Prominent Revolutionists.—It would be quite impossible to name all the influential laymen who identified themselves with this cause. The Declaration of Rights adopted by the Virginia legislature was written by George Mason, a Churchman. This was afterwards largely incorporated into the more famous and potent

Declaration of Independence, written chiefly by Thomas Jefferson, another Churchman. George Washington was a communicant of the Church, in which he had been baptized as an infant.[1] Other names may be cited as showing how largely the Church was represented among the foremost upholders of the infant Republic —for example, those of Benjamin Franklin,[2] Alexander Hamilton, Patrick Henry,[3] Francis Hopkinson, John Jay, Richard Henry Lee, John Marshall, David Morgan, Robert Morris, John Randolph, the Livingstons, the Pendletons, and the Pinkneys. Two-thirds of the signers of the Declaration of Independence were Church-

[1] Every now and then, some one arises to dispute this fact, and as often fresh proof is adduced to establish the statement more unquestionably. It is not claimed that he was frequent in his communions. In those days, very few could have been so classed, as well from lack of opportunity as from anything else; but that he was a recognised communicant, and so considered himself, is proved beyond peradventure.

[2] In a letter addressed to his daughter Sally, Franklin writes: 'Go constantly to church, whoever preaches. The act of devotion in the Common Prayer is your principal business there, and if properly attended to will do more towards amending the heart than sermons generally do. For they were composed by men of much greater piety and wisdom than our common composers can pretend to be.'

[3] It is said that when Governor Henry was dying, he called his children around him, exhorted them to reverence the Bible and Book of Common Prayer, and bade them see how a Christian could die. He was one of the most famous orators of his day. His powers in this direction were not known until, in December 1763, he argued what has since been known as 'the Parson's cause.' A short crop of tobacco had led to a great advance in its price, and had induced the colonial legislature to pass an Act commuting the salaries of the clergy (hitherto, as already noted, paid largely in this commodity) into money at the rate of two-pence the pound, which was the former rate. The King refused to sanction this Act; but the House of Burgesses determined to enforce it. One of the clergy brought suit to recover the marketable value of his salary. Unfortunately, Henry was on the opposing side. In the course of his impassioned address, he gave utterance to sentiments rapidly becoming common among his restive fellow-citizens, declaring, among other things, that 'a king, by disallowing acts of a salutary nature, from being the father of his people, degenerates into a tyrant, and forfeits all right to his subjects' obedience.'

men, and they were in the same proportion among the framers of the first Federal Constitution.

Help of the S. P. G.—It was indeed a time that tried men's minds and hearts; and the only wonder, perhaps, is that more of injury was not done to the cause of religion and piety amid so much that was distracting and dangerous. There would have been much more serious loss to the Church if it had not been for the humane and catholic policy of the S. P. G. in continuing their stipends to such missionaries as remained at their posts.

CHAPTER V

THE CLOSE OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

Preparations for more Aggressive Work.—With a bishop at last, and the way opening for the supply of other bishops, and with the cessation of war and its attendant evils, the Church began a more aggressive and prosperous career. It was some time, however, before she was able in every section to recover from the prejudices and actual losses incurred through the political crisis now happily ended. The whole number of clergymen in 1783 was not much more than one hundred. In Pennsylvania, at a time about this same period, the Rev. Dr. White was apparently the only one.

The First Ordinations.—Bishop Seabury lost no time in returning to America, and he was now empowered to increase the staff of clergymen. The question as to who is entitled to the honour of being the first deacon ordained in the United States (at Middletown, Connecticut, on August 3, 1785) cannot be definitely settled. The Rev. Dr. Beardsley, in his Centenary Address at Middletown, says: 'I take the names as they lie in the Registry Book of Bishop Seabury—not that this order determines the actual order of ordination, for I am confident that it does not.'[1]

In the extract from the manuscript minutes of the Proceedings at Middletown in 1785, given in Dr. Beardsley's *Life of Bishop Seabury*,'[2] we read: 'Then the clergy retired to their pews; and the Bishop began Divine Service with the Litany, according to the rubric in the office for the ordination of Deacons, the four

[1] *Seabury Centenary*, pp. 122, 123.

[2] Page 213.

following persons, Messrs. Van Dyke, Shelton, Baldwin of Connecticut, and Mr. Ferguson of Maryland, being present to be admitted to that order.' The friends of Mr. Baldwin contend that he was the first ordained, while Mr. Shelton's friends claim this distinction for him.

The Right Rev. Dr. George Burgess, first Bishop of Maine, who was well versed in matters of Church history, and was at one time rector of Christ Church, Hartford, while Mr. Baldwin was still living,[1] compiled very carefully and laboriously a List of Ordinations in the American Church. In it he gives this order: (1) Ashbel Baldwin; (2) Colin Ferguson; (3) Philo Shelton; (4) Henry Van Dyke. Dr. Beardsley's contention in favour of Mr. Shelton has in its favour the fact that in the Conventions of Connecticut, when both he and Mr. Baldwin were present, the name of Mr. Shelton was called first.

The First Consecration of a Church.—On the following Sunday, August 5th, 1785, the Rev. Mr. Ferguson was ordained to the priesthood. This was the first service of the kind ever held in America. So far as is known, the first consecration of a church building was that of Saint Paul's Church, Norwalk, Connecticut, July 15, 1786. On this same occasion, nearly four hundred persons were confirmed.

Early Organisations.—Long before the securing of the episcopate, the need had been felt of national or provincial organisation of at least the clergy of the colonies. Various meetings towards this end were held in different sections of the country. Special mention may be made of the one at Annapolis, Maryland, in August 1783, because of the important character of the Declaration then made, which, as being similar to the declarations made elsewhere, may fairly be taken to represent the minds of Churchmen generally at that time. It was as follows:—

Declaration of the Church's Rights and Liberties.—'A *Declaration* of certain *fundamental Rights and Liberties*

[1] He died February 8, 1846, in the eighty-eighth year of his age.

of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Maryland; had and made at a *Convention* or *Meeting* of the Clergy of said Church, duly assembled at Annapolis, August 13, 1783, agreeable to a Vote of the General Assembly passed upon a petition presented in the Name and Behalf of the said Clergy.

'*Whereas* by the Constitution and Form of Government of this State, "all persons professing the Christian Religion are equally entitled to protection in their Religious Liberty, and no person by any law (or otherwise) ought to be molested in his Person or Estate, on account of his religious persuasion or profession, or for his religious practice; unless, under Colour of Religion, any man shall disturb the good order, peace, or safety of the State, or shall infringe the Laws of morality, or injure others in their natural, civil, or religious Rights," —and

'Whereas the ecclesiastical and *Spiritual Independence* of the different Religious Denominations, Societies, Congregations, and Churches of Christians in this State, necessarily follows from, or is included in their *Civil Independence.*

First Formal Mention of the New Church's Name.—'Wherefore we, the Clergy of the *Protestant Episcopal Church of Maryland* (heretofore denominated *the Church of England*, as by Law established), with all Duty to the civil Authority of the State, and with all Love and Goodwill to our Fellow-Christians of every other religious Denomination, do hereby *declare, make known*, and *claim* the following, as certain of the *fundamental Rights and Liberties* inherent in and belonging to the said Episcopal Church, not only of common Right, but agreeably to the express Words, Spirit, and Design of the Constitution and Form of Government aforesaid, viz. :—

'I. We consider it as the undoubted Right of the said Protestant Episcopal Church, in common with other Christian Churches under the American Revolution, to complete and preserve herself as an *entire* Church, agreeably to her ancient Usages and Profession, and to have the free Enjoyment and free Exercise of those purely *Spiritual Powers* which are essential to the Being

of every *Church* or Congregation of the *faithful*, and which, being derived only from CHRIST and His APOSTLES, are to be maintained *independent* of every *foreign* or other Jurisdiction, so far as may be consistent with the civil Rights of Society.

'II. That ever since the *Reformation*, it has been the received doctrine of the Church whereof we are Members (and which, by the Constitution of this State, is entitled to the perpetual Enjoyment of certain Property and Rights under the Denomination of the Church of England) "That there be these three Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons," and that an *Episcopal Ordination and Commission* are necessary to the valid Administration of the Sacraments, and the due Exercise of the *Ministerial Functions* in the said Church.

'III. That, without calling in Question the *Rights*, *Modes*, and *Forms* of any other Christian Churches or Societies, or wishing the least contest with them on that Subject, we consider and *declare* it to be an essential Right of the said Protestant Episcopal Church to have and enjoy the Continuance of the said *three Orders of Ministers* for ever, so far as concerns Matters *purely spiritual*; and that no Persons, in the *Character* of Ministers, except such as are in the Communion of the said Church, and duly called to the Ministry by *regular Episcopal Ordination*, can or ought to be admitted into or enjoy any of the "Churches, Chapels, Glebes, or other Property," formerly belonging to the Church of England in this State, and which by the Constitution and Form of Government is secured to the said Church for ever, by whatever Name she, the said Church, or her superior Order of Ministers, may in future be denominated.

'IV. That as it is the Right, so it will be the Duty, of the said Church, when duly organised, constituted, and represented in a *Synod or Convention* of the different Orders of her Ministry and People, to revise her Liturgy, Forms of Prayer, and Public Worship, in order to adapt the same to the late *Revolution* and other local Circumstances of America; which it is humbly conceived may

and will be done, without any other or farther Departure from the venerable Order and beautiful Forms of Worship of the Church from whence we sprung, than may be found expedient in the Change of our Situation from a Daughter to a Sister-Church.

(*Signed, August* 13, 1783.)

William Smith, *President*, St. Paul's and Chester Parishes, Kent County.
John Gordon, St. Michael's, Talbot.
John M'Pherson, William and Mary Parish, Charles County.
Samuel Keene, Dorchester Parish, Dorchester County.
William West, St. Paul's Parish, Baltimore County.
William Thompson, St. Stephen's, Cecil County.
Walter Magowan, St. James's Parish, Ann-Arundel County.
John Stephen, All Faith Parish, St. Mary's County.
Tho. Jno. Claggett, St. Paul's Parish, Prince George's County.
George Goldie, King and Queen, St. Mary's County.
Joseph Messinger, St. Andrew's Parish, St. Mary's County.
John Bowie, St. Peter's Parish, Talbot County.
Walter Harrison, Durham Parish, Charles County.
William Hanna, St. Margaret's, Westminster Parish, Ann-Arundel County.
Thomas Gates, St. Ann's, Annapolis.

(*Signed, June* 23, 1784.)

John Andrews, St. Thomas's Parish, Baltimore County.
Hamilton Bell, Stepney Parish, Somerset County.
Francis Walker, now of Shrewsbury Parish, Kent County.'

This document would seem to be the first one of any particular authority in which is used the name so long legally attached to the American Church, namely, 'The Protestant Episcopal Church.'

Lay Delegates.—The constitution of these assemblies was the subject of much earnest controversy. Bishop

Seabury and others were much opposed to the admission of lay delegates. The Rev. Dr. William White and others as earnestly favoured their admission, arguing that this feature was necessary to assure united acceptance of what might be decreed. In the first General Convention, which met in Philadelphia from September 28 until October 7, 1785, there were present more laymen than clergymen. From Pennsylvania there were five clergymen and thirteen laymen. New England was not represented at all, owing to the objections existing there against a mixed Convention. The dioceses represented were New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and South Carolina. In this Convention steps were taken to conform the Prayer Book to the changed condition of the country, and to secure additional bishops from England.

The Validity of Bishop Seabury's Consecration.—Another General Convention was held in Philadelphia in the October of the ensuing year. A matter of great importance was there discussed, one which had already been largely before the Churchmen of America—the validity of Bishop Seabury's consecration, and thus the right of those whom he had ordained to officiate. They had already been forbidden by some to exercise their ministerial functions, even by such kindly-disposed persons as Dr. White; and at length a general resolution of exclusion was adopted. Strange as it may now appear that such a controversy should have arisen, it would seem that many had their doubts concerning the matter—doubts, it must be confessed, not a little emphasised, as in the case of the Rev. Samuel Provoost of New York, by former political differences. Much indignation was felt in New England because of this reflection upon the validity of Bishop Seabury's consecration, and there were some of those that stoutly maintained it who expressed the opinion—such was still the antipathy to England—that the Scotch succession was much more acceptable than the other could have been.

Revision of the Prayer Book.—Considerable time and labour were spent in the revision of the Prayer Book, some changes in which were so objectionable to the

English prelates as to jeopardise their consent to consecrate any new bishops. There can be but few Churchmen in America to-day who do not feel very grateful for the interposition of these objections, by which their forefathers were saved from the calamitous results of a departure from Catholic truth and unity.

General Convention at Wilmington.—The necessary steps to reassure the English authorities were taken in the General Convention held in Wilmington, Delaware, on October 10 and 11, 1786. The Apostles' Creed was affirmed in all its integrity, and the Nicene Creed was unanimously added to the Prayer Book. Adverse action was taken as to inserting there the Athanasian Creed. The constitutional provision styled by the English bishops 'a degradation of the clerical, and still more of the episcopal character,' had been satisfactorily amended in Philadelphia, and the way now seemed open for obtaining additional bishops. The Convention at Wilmington therefore proceeded to sign the testimonials of Dr. Provoost of New York, Dr. White of Pennsylvania, and Dr. Griffith of Virginia.

Consecration of Bishops White and Provoost.—These gentlemen made ready for their immediate sailing; but Dr. Griffith was hindered in various ways from going. The other two bishops-elect arrived in London on November 21; and were consecrated, amid many tokens of goodwill on the part of the King and others, in the chapel of Lambeth Palace, on Sunday, February 4, 1787. The Archbishop of Canterbury (Moore) was assisted by the Archbishop of York (Markham) and by the Bishops of Bath and Wells (Moss) and of Peterborough (Hinchcliffe). Bishop White was consecrated first. His account of the event, as given in his *Memoirs* of the Church, is very interesting, and relates the history of the sermon which was preached by the Rev. Dr. Drake, one of the Archbishop's chaplains: 'The sermon was a sensible discussion of the long-litigated subject of the authority of the Church to ordain rites and ceremonies. The text was, "Let all things be done decently and in order" (1 Cor. xiv. 40). The discourse had very little reference to the peculiarity of the occasion. The truth was, as the

Archbishop had told us on Friday, on our way to court, that he had spoken to a particular friend to compose a sermon for the occasion, and had given him a sketch of what he had wished to be the scope of it. This friend had just sent him information of a domestic calamity, which would excuse him from attendance; and the Archbishop was then under the necessity of giving a short notice to one of his chaplains.'[1] Besides the Archbishop's family and household, very few were present, strange enough as it seems to us to-day. Among them was the Rev. Dr. Duché, one of Bishop White's most intimate friends, who had shared his pastoral work in Philadelphia.

Bishop White's Account.—Bishop White further remarks: 'The solemnity being over, we dined with the Archbishop and the bishops, and spent with them the remainder of the day. I took occasion to mention to his Grace my conviction that the American Church would be sensible of the kindness now shown, and my trust that the American bishops, besides the usual incentives to duty, would have this in addition, lest the Church of England should have cause to regret her act, performed on this day. He answered that he fully believed there would be no such cause; that the prospect was very agreeable to him; that he bore a great affection for our Church; and that he should always be glad to hear of her prosperity, and also of the safe arrival and the welfare of us individually.'[2]

The Validity of Bishop Seabury's Consecration again discussed.—Upon the return of Bishops Provoost and White to America, the question of the validity of Bishop Seabury's consecration was discussed anew. It arose, for example, in connection with the proposed consecration of the Bishop of Virginia. The two bishops consecrated in England thought themselves precluded from joining with Bishop Seabury, because of what they considered at least an implied promise to the English bishops not to proceed to any consecration until one more of their line was able to co-operate. Neither would

[1] *Memoirs*, pp. 136, 137. [2] *Memoirs*, p. 137.

they proceed without the canonically-required third bishop, notwithstanding the request to this effect on the part of the Standing Committee of Virginia.

The Case of the Rev. Dr. Griffith.—As showing that there was still a lack of appreciation of the necessity of the episcopate on the part of Churchmen, it may be mentioned that the diocese utterly neglected to raise the funds necessary for Dr. Griffith's voyage to England, and that he himself believed that there was even hostility to the scheme. Disheartened, as he well may have been, at the manner in which he and his election had been treated, he finally withdrew his acceptance of it, dying shortly afterwards while in attendance upon the General Convention in Philadelphia, October 1789.

Bishop Seabury showed every disposition to avoid schismatical or even unfraternal proceedings. Immediately upon their arrival, Bishops Provoost and White received from him most cordial greetings, and an invitation to a conference. This was not held, and the question at issue remained in abeyance until the General Convention of 1789, when the following resolution was unanimously adopted:—'Resolved, That it is the opinion of this Convention that the consecration of the Right Rev. Dr. Seabury to the episcopal office is valid.'

As to the Consecration of Mr. Bass.—This Convention was held in July; and before taking a recess the three bishops were unanimously requested to consecrate the Rev. Edward Bass, bishop-elect of the combined dioceses of Massachusetts and New Hampshire, it being understood that before this was done the New England dioceses should be represented in an adjourned convention.[1]

To this proposition there was a generous response; and accordingly, when the General Convention reassembled in Philadelphia on Michaelmas Day, Bishop Seabury appeared, accompanied by clergymen from Connecticut and the two other dioceses already united. These delegations, however, were composed exclusively of clergymen,

[1] The consecration of Bishop Bass did not take place as soon as was first expected, being delayed until 1797, by which time Bishops Claggett and Smith had been consecrated, and the two lines of succession had been united.

LIBRARY

coming as they did from a section of the country where the opposition to lay-representation still prevailed very strongly.

Further Revision of the Prayer Book.—At this same Convention, the work of revising the Prayer Book occupied much time and thought. Another effort was made by Bishop Seabury and the New England clergy to incorporate the Athanasian Creed with the Prayer Book, the bishop giving it as his opinion that without it there would be difficulty in combating the errors against which it was composed. The effort, however, proved unavailing, very much to their regret.

The Athanasian Creed.—The permissory use of the Creed was agreed to by the House of Bishops, but negatived in the House of Deputies. They had the satisfaction of seeing the American Communion Office brought into closer agreement with the Scotch, according to the Concordat entered into with the Scotch bishops by the Bishop of Connecticut. In regard to the discussions on the revision of the Prayer Book, Bishop White writes in his *Memoirs*: 'To this day, there are recollected with satisfaction the hours which were spent with Bishop Seabury[1] on the important subjects which came before them, and especially the Christian temper which he manifested all along.'[2]

Consecration of Bishops Madison and Claggett.—On September 19, 1790, the Rev. James Madison, D.D., President of William and Mary College, Virginia, was consecrated bishop of that diocese by the Archbishop of Canterbury in his chapel at Lambeth Palace, assisted by the Bishops of London and Rochester. Shortly afterwards (September 17, 1792) the first episcopal consecration in America occurred, when the Rev. Thomas John Claggett, D.D., was made Bishop of Maryland by the joint action of the Bishops of Connecticut, Pennsylvania, New York, and Virginia, thus fusing the two sources of orders which have ever since entered into the constitution of the ministry of the American Church.

[1] Bishop Provoost did not attend the Convention.
[2] *Memoirs*, p. 149.

Early Methodism.—While thus treating of these original consecrations, it will be quite in the line of chronological order to narrate some events which occurred in the earlier history of Methodism, and the appropriation by some of its members of the title and some of the prerogatives of bishops. In the beginning of the year 1791, the Rev. Dr. Coke, who had been ordained a priest in the Church of England, addressed a confidential communication to Bishop White, in which, after reminding him of this fact, he went on to write of a certain commission which he had received in England from John Wesley, and to suggest a plan by which a union could be effected between the Church and the Methodist—or, as it was often then styled, the Methodistical Society. The plan, in substance, was that all Methodist ministers should receive episcopal ordination, and remain under the government of their own superintendents.

Coke and Asbury.—In regard to the commission from Wesley, Coke wrote: 'He did indeed solemnly invest me, *so far as he had the right to do so*, with Episcopal authority,[1] but did not intend, I think, that an entire separation should take place. . . . He went further, I am sure, than he would have gone if he could have foreseen some events which followed. And this I am certain of—that he is now sorry for the separation.'

Coke had several interviews with Bishop White, who was always very kind and conciliatory. He corresponded also with Bishop Seabury. More than once he suggested to these two prelates that he and Mr. Asbury should be consecrated by them as bishops of the Methodist Society within the Church. The imposition of hands by Wesley on Coke had been in secret, when the former was confined by old age and feebleness to his bedroom. Now Asbury asked a similar favour of Coke, who proceeded to grant it, in conjunction with a German minister. The name which they both assumed, in accordance with Wesley's instructions, was 'Superintendent.' When they took the name of bishop and began to act as such,

[1] Dr. Coke does not here appear to remember that, in a letter, he had asked Wesley in vain to make him a bishop.

Wesley seems to have realised the mistake he had made, and wrote in no measured terms to Asbury: 'You and the Doctor differ from me. I study to be little; you study to be great. I creep; *you strut along*. . . . How can you, how dare you suffer yourself to be called Bishop? I shudder, I start at the very thought. Men may call me a knave, or a fool, a rascal, a scoundrel, and I am content; but they shall never by my consent call me Bishop. For my sake, for God's sake, for Christ's sake, put an end to this! Let the Presbyterians do what they please, but let the Methodists know their calling better.'[1] It is not surprising that Asbury, in commenting on this letter, should exclaim, 'Unpleasant expressions!'

Charles Wesley's indignation.—Charles Wesley was equally indignant at the whole proceeding. He had been for some time ignorant of his brother's setting apart of Coke, even to a superintendency. When told of it, he spoke of the act as one entirely repugnant to his brother's avowed principles, and as leaving an indelible blot upon his name. He could only excuse it on the ground of his not being, on account of his physical condition, altogether aware of what he was doing.[2] His well-known rhyme contains so pithily the whole rejoinder to these schismatical proceedings, that it can hardly be omitted here—

> 'So easily are bishops made
> By man's or woman's whim;
> Wesley his hands on Coke hath laid,
> But who laid hands on *him*?'

In an interview with Bishop White in 1786-7, he gave him a pamphlet written by his brother and himself in the earlier part of their lives, and directed against a secession from the Church, the sentiments of which he reaffirmed as a censure on what had lately been done in America.[3]

[1] Wesley's Works (1829), xiii. 58.
[2] Jackson's *Life of Charles Wesley*, ii. 392.
[3] White's *Memoirs*, p. 171.

It is not uncharitable, but helpful towards a fuller understanding of the matter, to add that Coke, upon hearing of Wesley's death, returned to England, and in 1813 applied confidentially to Lord Liverpool and William Wilberforce to be appointed Bishop for India. He himself suggested the condition that he would be a most loyal son of the Church, and conform to any regulations that might be imposed upon him by the bishops at home and by the Government.

John Wesley's inconsistency.—While it were an easy thing to show from the writings of John Wesley that he was, theoretically, what would be called a good Churchman, yet, practically, he was far from being a consistent one. Out of his intense desire to do good, he would sacrifice the Church's order and discipline. This he himself sometimes realised, and when too late, bitterly regretted. Doubtless, he was sincere in exhorting his disciples not to leave the Church: but he must have seen how they were, under his leadership, slowly but surely drifting away from her, and ought at least to have foreseen that this would inevitably be all the more the case after his death.

The Methodists conscious of their wants.—In the light of subsequent events, it is also most interesting and significant to observe how conscious of their irregularities and churchlessness the early Methodists were. Asbury was horrified to learn that, during his imprisonment in Delaware for political reasons, his co-religionists had been ordaining one another. He quickly travelled to Virginia and had such 'ordinations' declared invalid; and such was the feeling on the point, that the Methodists in that section and elsewhere would then resort only to the clergy of the Church for the Sacraments, although this meant frequently very long and tedious journeys on the part of both clergy and people.

The attitude of Churchmen.—It is unquestionably sad to contemplate how much of loss in every way has accrued from the separation which the Methodists finally consummated; but it is not altogether easy or safe at this distance to lay the blame upon the Churchmen of the day. So far as one can judge from the records of

their sentiments and actions, they were disposed to be conciliatory in the maintenance of their convictions and principles. It was not always prudent for them to confide in the proposals made them by the leaders of the new Society, between whom there was at times a rivalry or jealousy which very much interfered with reaching a good understanding.[1]

[1] See White's *Memoirs*, p. 170; and see Appendix for letters of Bishop White and Dr. Coke on this subject.

CHAPTER VI

THE BEGINNING OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

A Discouraging Outlook.—The early part of the nineteenth century disclosed, even in the oldest settlements of the Church, conditions and prospects far from encouraging. Indeed, in Maryland they were described as 'deplorable,' and in Virginia they were accompanied by 'the danger of her total ruin, unless great exertions, by the blessing of Providence, are employed to raise her.' This is not altogether amazing, when one considers the demoralising effect of the long war, with its alienations, suspicions, and losses, and chiefly the difficulties in coping with the various denominations that were not embarrassed in their operations by any regard to what is involved in the idea of the Episcopate. The continuity of the Church at all under the circumstances, and her unchallenged loyalty to the fundamental Catholic principles, are but additional proofs of her Divine origin, and of God's blessing upon her fidelity.

The Articles of Religion.—The General Convention of 1801 set itself right as to the proper relations to be maintained between the Church and the State by omitting the twenty-first Article of Religion as found in the English Prayer Book, and by substituting the following in place of the thirty-ninth Article:—

'**Of the Power of the Civil Magistrate.**—The power of the civil magistrate extendeth to all men, as well Clergy as Laity, in all things temporal, but hath no authority in things purely spiritual. And we hold it to be the duty of all men who are professors of the Gospel to pay

respectful obedience to the civil authority, regularly and legitimately constituted.'

Church and State.—The American Church has notably adhered to this line of policy throughout even the most critical periods of the national history. Nor has she any ground for complaint in general as to the manner in which the State has regarded her spiritual prerogatives. The contention of many of her members as to the wholly religious character of marriage, and their scruples against the State's ignoring of the prohibited degrees and against the allowance of divorce for any cause, must be held in abeyance, especially so since her own legislation is not as yet wholly consistent in these respects.

Further as to the Articles of Religion.—Reference has been made to the Articles of Religion as adopted by the American Church. There were some (including Bishops Seabury, Provoost, and Madison) who thought that the doctrines of the Church were sufficiently expressed in the Prayer Book without them. Others contended that they would be useful safeguards against the teaching of what was contrary to that which the Church actually held, but had not otherwise stated so explicitly. No formal subscription to the Articles has ever been required of the clergy.

Identity with Church of England.—To emphasise still further the practical identity of the two Churches, the bishops in 1814 issued, with the approval of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, a declaration to the effect that the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America was the Church formerly known under the name of 'The Church of England in America.'

By concurrent action at the same Convention, it was recommended that hereafter when psalms or hymns in metre were sung, the congregation should stand, the former posture during such worship having been sitting.

Church Music.—There was in the early part of this same century considerable discussion of the question of Church Music; and many advocated not only the enlargement of the Hymnary, but also the introduction of more chanting in the services. Both propositions, however, were stoutly

resisted. It was by no means an uncommon experience, when the chanting of the *Venite* was suggested, to hear the counter-suggestion that it was only 'the entering wedge' to something very inconsistent with the Protestant character of the Church. There was the same prejudice in after years against the regular chanting or singing of the *Te Deum*, and to the use of the *Gloria Patri* between the psalms—a prejudice that had not wholly disappeared (incredible as it may seem) in some parishes until after the middle of the century.

Increase of the Hymnal.—As to the increase in the number of hymns, Bishop White writes, in regard to a proposition in this direction made at the General Convention of 1808, that 'it was with pain' that he saw this subject brought forward. 'This was not,' he continues, writing of himself in the third person, 'because he doubted either of the lawfulness of celebrating the praises of God in other strains than those of David, or of the expediency of having a few well-selected hymns for the especial subjects of the evangelical economy, which can no otherwise be celebrated in the Psalms than in an accommodated sense. Nevertheless, there is so little of good poetry except the Scriptural on sacred subjects; and there was so great danger of having a selection accommodated to the degree of animal sensibility, affected by those who were the most zealous in the measure, that the adoption of it seemed questionable. It was, however, yielded to by the bishops, under the hope that the selection of a few, and those unexceptionable, although some of them, perhaps, are not to be extolled for the excellence either of the sentiments or of the poetry, might prevent the unauthorised use of compositions which no rational Christian can approve of.'

New Provisions as to the Hymnal.—At every subsequent General Convention applications were made for the authorisation of additional hymns. In 1826, the number of hymns was increased to two hundred and twelve. In 1832, there was 'set forth, and allowed to be sung in all the congregations,' a Selection in Metre of the Psalms of David and of Hymns, to the number respectively of one hundred and twenty-four and two hundred and twelve.

This remained the sole provision in this respect until the year 1871, before which time it had been generally felt that more variety was needed, and that some of the 'selections in metre' were too archaic and unpoetical to be of much profit to the worshipper. Certainly, the third verse in Selection 91 justified this criticism :—

> 'His liberal favours he extends,
> To some he gives, to others lends;
> Yet what his charity impairs,
> He saves by prudence in affairs.'

The hymns were, in some instances, not more felicitous or appropriate in their language. It was not difficult in subsequent revisions to get rid of such a hymn as that beginning—

> 'Hark! from the tombs a *mournful* sound,'

nor, despite the elaborate efforts of musicians in its favour, another, taking its origin from a Pagan emperor, commencing

> 'Vital spark of heavenly flame,
> Quit, O quit this mortal frame';

nor another yet—

> 'How short the race our friend has run,
> Cut down in all *his* bloom.
>
> . . . . .
>
> Long, long before life's brilliant noon
> May come death's *gloomy* night.'

A charming spirit of impartiality was manifested towards the two combined selections in the rubric which prescribed that 'Whenever the Hymns are used at the celebration of Divine Service, a certain portion or portions of the Psalms of David in metre shall also be sung.'

Church Choirs.—The place of the choir in churches has been almost universally changed within the present century. In the beginning, there was no choir at all in many places, the tunes being set—frequently, with the aid of pitch-pipes or tuning-forks—by the parish clerks, who have now entirely disappeared. Sometimes there was the accompaniment of a violin or two ere the time of melodeons and organs arrived.

Parish Clerks.—Parish clerks, to whom reference has been made, were at one time functionaries of considerable importance, especially in their own estimation. Besides setting the tunes, they led in, and not infrequently said alone, the responses, and gave out all the notices of services, parish society meetings, funerals, and the like. In some parts of the country they were the medium for advertising the loss of children and live stock.

The position of the choirs, when they were organised, was almost universally in the gallery. Of late years, it has been almost as universally in or near the chancel, galleries having in many instances disappeared, scarcely a church built within the last few decades having any such places.

Heating Arrangements.—While alluding to the construction of church-buildings, it may be interesting to add that very few of such edifices were supplied with chimneys. The women used foot-stoves (containing live coals) or heated bricks or stones. When in some parishes it was proposed by the younger men to build chimneys and introduce regular stoves, the older ones resented the idea as bordering upon effeminacy, and in some instances went so far as to threaten their discontinuance of attendance at such churches.

The Constitution of Choirs.—At first, the choirs were constituted of any material that was available, chiefly of men and women. In many so-called fashionable or aristocratic churches they consisted of skilled and well-paid quartettes, who, however admirable as artists, were not renowned for their devoutness, and took little, if any, pains to encourage congregational music. Within the past twenty years, choirs of surpliced men and boys have become very common, even in the smaller towns and parishes.

Surpliced Choirs.—They are, however, by no means a novelty in the American Church. There is extant a record of a Bill under date of 1798 for washing the surplices of the children who sang in St. Michael's Church, Charleston, South Carolina, and there is proof of their service in this capacity at an earlier date. In

1807 the organist was requested to have at least twelve choir-boys. A parishioner of Christ's Church, Philadelphia, left a bequest in 1816 as the beginning of a fund 'for teaching six boys as a choir to sing in the orchestra' of that church.

They had, however, so entirely disappeared before the middle of the century, that when they were revived they were looked upon as something quite new. In the General Convention of 1844, the Rev. Dr. Mead of Connecticut, while alluding to such a choir that Dr. Hawks had established at St. Thomas's Hall, Flushing, New York, declared that it was the only instance of such use of the surplice which he had ever known.

Need of additional Bishops.—The need of more bishops was being pressed upon the attention of the Church, especially with reference to what were then styled the Western States, but only favourable resolutions were passed. Even as to the more Eastern States, it was very difficult to supply this need, and but little encouragement was afforded to efforts looking towards the creation of new dioceses. In the very beginning of the nineteenth century, the clergy of Virginia and of the western part of Pennsylvania moved in this direction; but Bishop White,[1] although recognising his own inability to fulfil all that was requisite, discouraged the idea. It was revived in 1842, only to be discouraged once more by Bishop Onderdonk; and it was not until 1871 that the scheme (as far as Pennsylvania was concerned) was carried out under the cordial approbation of Bishop Alonzo Potter.

Pastoral Letters.—At the General Convention of 1811, the bishops put forth what is known as the Pastoral Letter, and this has been their rule, with but one exception, in every subsequent convention. It is prepared by a Special Committee of the House of Bishops; and, after being approved by a majority of that House, it is read at the closing service of the session, and afterwards in the various parishes throughout the country.

[1] White's *Memoirs*, p. 33.

It is supposed to deal with the statistical and other reports handed in during the Convention, and with such of the more important topics as appear most timely and profitable to discuss, as between Fathers in God and their spiritual children.

The General Convention, how constituted.—It may not be amiss to state here the constitution of the General Convention, which consists of the House of Bishops and the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies. In the former house, all diocesan and missionary bishops are entitled to all its rights and privileges. Any bishop whose resignation has been consummated according to the canonical provisions in force, and who has resigned on account of advanced age, and consequent bodily infirmity, is still entitled to all the rights and precedences to which he would otherwise be entitled. The status of bishops-coadjutor in regard to such matters has not yet been definitely fixed.

The House of Deputies.—The other house is composed of four clergymen and four laymen from each diocese, elected by their respective diocesan conventions. By a Standing Order, one clerical and one lay delegate chosen by any convocation of all the clergy and representatives of the laity called by the authority of the bishop of any missionary jurisdiction, or chosen by a similar convocation of the Churches in Europe duly convened, may have seats in the Convention, with all the rights of other deputies except that of voting.

Concurrent Legislation.—Any kind of legislation may be originated in either house; but it requires the concurrent action of both houses to make such legislation valid. It was not until after considerable discussion that, in 1808, the House of Bishops was accorded the right of negativing the action of the other house. It was also after a number of attempts in this direction that in 1856 it was made requisite that all lay delegates should be communicants of the Church.

The House of Bishops.—The House of Bishops always sits with closed doors; and it is supposed to be a breach of confidence for anything but its decisions to be reported publicly. The House of Clerical and Lay Deputies sits

with open doors, except when its members are considering the nominations to vacant bishoprics which may be made to them by the House of Bishops. The sessions generally last about three weeks, and are held triennially, at such places as may be determined by a vote of the previous Convention.

Presiding Officers.—In the House of Bishops, the bishop presides who is the oldest present in point of consecration. His duties, however, generally devolve upon a chairman elected by the House. In the other house the President (thus far always a clergyman) is chosen by the members, and serves until the next Convention. It is generally conceded that few deliberative bodies in America can be compared with the General Convention for the high character and attainments of their members.

Lay Representation.—While, as we have already seen, there were stout objections in the beginning to laymen forming a part of the Convention, yet such has been the growth in conviction as to their usefulness in this connection that no one is now found to suggest their elimination. They are to be found also upon the Standing Committee (which is the ecclesiastical authority of the diocese during a vacancy in the episcopate, or, if the bishop so determine, during his prolonged absence) of all the dioceses except Connecticut, Maryland, and Easton.

Layman for Bishop.—In one remarkable instance, such was the esteem in which a layman was held, that he was urged by the clergy of Massachusetts and Rhode Island to receive orders as deacon and priest, that they might with as little delay as possible elect him their bishop. This was the case with Judge Dudley Atkins Tyng of Newburyport, Massachusetts, after the death of Bishop Bass in 1803. Of this prelate many quaint anecdotes are told. One of them concerns himself and the senior warden of the parish of Newburyport, of which he remained rector after his consecration. They were fond of shooting together; the warden always insisted on carrying and loading the bishop's gun. When any game was encountered, the warden would prepare the gun, cock it duly, and, presenting it to the bishop, say to him,

'Right reverend sir, shoot!' It need hardly be added that by the time all these courteous preliminaries had been completed, there was but little likelihood of shooting successfully.

Bishop Griswold.—Bishop Griswold (1766-1843) was one of the bishops in the Eastern States—the title of his see was the 'Eastern Diocese,' of which more will be said—whose characteristics and labours made him a prominent figure in their ecclesiastical history. He was born in an atmosphere inimical to bishops. A neighbour of his told him that when himself a child he had been made to believe that so soon as bishops came to America, they would claim from the people a tenth of everything, children included. He was the tenth child of his parents, and one can easily imagine the dread with which he viewed their probable advent before he should die.

Upon one occasion, the good bishop started on a visitation to Wickford, which necessitated his crossing Narragansett Bay. He encountered an unusually severe gale, on account of which the regular ferry-boat had been withdrawn. He persuaded an experienced seaman to start with him in a small sailboat; but even his courage failed him when about half way over, and he was minded to go back. When the bishop learned that the boatman's dread was mostly because of insufficient ballast, he threw himself full length at the bottom of the boat, and thus encouraged his companion to continue the voyage. This, indeed, was successfully accomplished; but on arriving at the church, he found it closed, as no one had thought that the bishop would venture over in such a storm.

It was he of whom the rather familiar story is first told—of his meeting a Dissenter who, while making loud professions of his own goodness, asked the bishop if he thought that there was much vital piety in the Episcopal Church. He replied in his own quiet way, 'None to *speak of*, sir.'

The Eastern Diocese.—The Eastern Diocese was composed of states already organised into dioceses: Massachusetts, 1785; Rhode Island, 1790; Vermont, 1790; New Hampshire, 1802. Maine was then a province of

Massachusetts. Vermont had not been admitted into union with the General Convention when it joined with the other states in forming the Eastern Diocese, which was rather a confederation or a province than a diocese.

Its Disintegration.—At the meeting for organisation held in Boston on May 29, 1810, the Rev. Mr. Griswold was unanimously elected as bishop, and provision was made for a Standing Committee of seven, consisting of at least one from each state.[1] When, through the quiet, effective work of Bishop Griswold, strength succeeded to weakness, and courage to despair, the dioceses thus confederated began to feel able to stand alone. The disintegration began with the withdrawal of Vermont in 1832. This was followed six years later by the desire of Massachusetts to elect an assistant-bishop, and by the amendment to the Constitution of the Eastern Diocese providing for its dissolution on the death of Bishop Griswold. In 1838, New Hampshire and Rhode Island withdrew, leaving only Massachusetts and Maine. When Maine became a State in 1820, a Convention was called to organise an independent diocese, which being done, it was admitted into union with the General Convention in the same year. Upon the death of Bishop Griswold, the Right Rev. Dr. Henshaw, Bishop of Rhode Island, was invited to take charge of the diocese until the election and consecration, in 1847, of the Rev. Dr. George Burgess.

The aggressive spirit of the Church was now (1815–17) beginning to manifest itself in a more marked degree. Regions, half a century later within a few hours' travel of the Atlantic coast, were then considered distant; and the term not infrequently used, 'the Church beyond the Alleghanies,' included anything west of that mountainous division. The Churchmen living there wished to enter into some ecclesiastical organisation under the auspices

[1] The members of the first Standing Committee were the Rev. J. S. Gardiner, D.D., of Boston, the Rev. William Montague of Dedham, the Rev. Asa Eaton of Boston, the Rev. Daniel Barber of Claremont, New Hampshire, the Rev. Abraham Bronson of Manchester, Vermont, the Rev. Nathan B. Crocker of Rhode Island, and Mr. David Green of Boston.

of the General Convention, which body in 1817 adopted the following resolutions:—

'Resolved, That though the measure of a Convention comprising sundry states in the western country may be a measure of temporary expediency, it cannot be authorised by this Convention consistently with the general constitution of the Church, which recognises only a convention of the Church in each State.

'Resolved, That it be earnestly recommended to the authorities of this Church in each State, respectively, to adopt measures for sending missionaries to our destitute brethren in the western states; such missionaries to be subject to the direction of the ecclesiastical authority of the state or states in which they officiate.'

Missionary ventures.—Some of the success attending the missionary services in what was then denominated the West was owing, under God, to an organisation of Philadelphia Churchmen known as 'The Episcopal Missionary Society.' At the beginning of its history it sent a clergyman to Ohio, who also laboured in Kentucky and Tennessee. The Rev. Joseph Doddridge of Virginia, one of the most earnest clergymen of his day, expressed the opinion that half of the original settlers in those parts were Churchmen, and could by proper exertion be reclaimed from the infidelity and sectarianism into which, for want of regular ministrations, they were drifting.

The Rev. Eleazar Williams, the 'Lost Dauphin.'—With the inauguration by the General Convention in 1820-21 of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society, more extended operations both at home and abroad began to occupy the earnest members of the Church. At home, one of the first missions undertaken was to the Indians at Green Bay, Wisconsin, which was reorganised in 1827 under the direction of the Rev. Eleazar Williams, described as 'of Indian extraction,' though he was widely known by his claim to be the 'Lost Dauphin,' or Louis XVII. of France. This was a venture greatly favoured by Bishop Hobart, and became very popular with Sunday-schools and wealthy women. In the East, when it was announced that he was expected to preach, large congre-

gations were always in attendance to hear him. He was a man of striking appearance, and of courteous, agreeable manners, who easily made and retained friends, among whom were many who firmly believed in his royal descent.

CHAPTER VII

THE CHURCH REVIVAL

The Oxford Movement.—There have been times when party lines were drawn closely, and men differed from each other with words of warmth, and occasionally even of bitterness. But these occasions have been few and short-lived. Indeed, there have been practically only two or three of such periods. It was but natural that the daughter Church should share with the Church of England in the excitement attending the issue of the 'Tracts for the Times.' This was done to a considerable extent, and much pamphleteering was indulged in by both sides. Efforts were made to commit the Church to some formal declarations upon the points at issue; but, except in a few dioceses, this was not done, the General Convention contenting itself by resolving that the Faith was already amply set forth in the Church's formularies, and that existing canons were sufficient to deal with any alleged departures from it.

The Carey ordination.—In the light of the present condition of affairs, it seems almost incredible that there should have been such incidents as were connected with the Carey ordination, or that they should have attracted such wide attention. Arthur Carey was a young candidate for Holy Orders in New York, of unblemished and charming character, and of unusual talent and learning. He graduated from the General Theological Seminary in 1842, before he was old enough to be ordained. In his examination, he failed to satisfy the ultra-Protestant views of some of the chaplains, who felt it their duty publicly to enter their protest at the time of his ordina-

tion. The bishop, however, being entirely satisfied from his own and others' examination, proceeded to ordain him.

Early prejudices.—As showing the temper of the times, and the now insignificant character of things to which so much importance was then attached, it may be mentioned that among the things which were considered as very objectionable and representative of erroneous and strange doctrine were the use of evergreens at Christmas for decorating churches, stained-glass windows with figures even of Biblical saints, the reading of the Ante-Communion service at the altar instead of at the reading-desk, the introduction of lecterns, and the placing of prayer-desks at the side of the chancel so that the minister should not be obliged to face the people, the chanting at all of the *Venite*, and later on the chanting of the *Te Deum* more than once a month, that is, on what was known as 'Communion Sunday.' Bishops refused to consecrate churches where the Holy Table was without visible legs, to confirm in churches where there were crosses upon the altars, or to officiate where flowers were used in decorations. And even as late as 1871—when surpliced choirs were quite common—a bishop presented one of his clergymen for trial because he had refused to disband such a choir and give up singing processional hymns.

Weekly Celebrations.—In the matter of weekly Celebrations, it is believed that the honour of being the pioneer in establishing them in America belongs to St. Peter's Church, Ashtabula, Ohio, where they were begun in the year 1842. One of the first to follow this good example was St. Peter's Church, Philadelphia, under the rectorship of the Rev. William Henry Odenheimer (1817-79), afterwards Bishop of New Jersey, to whom the Church was much indebted in other respects as to Catholic doctrine and practice. He was reckoned among the model parish priests of his day.

The Civil War.—After a lull of some duration, the heat of ecclesiastical controversy was waxing warmer, when for a time it disappeared in the greater strife which arose concerning civil and political affairs, and which

culminated in the furious and sanguinary war that raged between the North and the South from the early spring of 1861 to a little later in the spring of 1865. It was upon the question of states rights, as chiefly involved in the matter of slavery. The states which favoured slavery asserted their right to secede at will from the Union. The vast majority of the people in the other states resented this view, and insisted upon their remaining in their former relations to the Republic. In the sad contest which ensued, there was much bitterness on both sides, and such a sundering of ties of family and friendship as seemed to make it utterly impossible for an amicable union ever to be restored.

The Charity of Churchmen.—Nevertheless, in the Providence of God, the Church was endued with such a spirit of forbearance and foresight as enabled her to avoid much of the entanglements that beset other religious bodies. Strenuous efforts were made by many, while remaining loyal to the Government, to avoid the discussion of merely political issues, and to refrain and to keep others from saying or doing anything which might encourage the idea of ecclesiastical separation. The General Convention which met in New York in September 1862 proceeded on the idea that there had been no such separation. While there were no representatives present from the Southern States, the names of all such dioceses were regularly called, and seats were assigned to them as usual. The existence of the war was by no means ignored; but while there was great latitude of discussion—participated in by the most distinguished clergymen and laymen of the day—the marvellously charitable manner in which it was conducted won universal attention and admiration. Throughout the war, the same spirit was cultivated; and it was confidently believed that when peace ensued, there would be a spontaneous reunion of the Church.

Threatening obstacles.—Not that there were no great difficulties in the way, several of which threatened to make any kind of reunion impossible. It was not so much the establishment of what was styled 'The Protestant Episcopal Church in the Confederate States of

America.' This step seemed to be necessary to those living in the states which had asserted their independence; but in setting up this ecclesiastical establishment, they took great pains to deny any separation from their fellow-churchmen elsewhere in America, except as it was related to purely political considerations. The Committee on the State of the Church declared that 'though now found within different political boundaries, the Church remains substantially one.' In the single edition of a separate Prayer Book (published in London), the only alteration allowed or made was the substitution of the word *Confederate* for the word *United*.

The two chief difficulties. Bishop Polk's case.—The difficulties lay in the incidents which occurred during the period of separation. One was the taking up of arms by the Right Rev. Leonidas Polk, D.D., Bishop of Louisiana, a graduate in early years of the Military Academy at West Point, and always a man of impulse and activity. He was commissioned a major-general in the Confederate Army, and participated in a number of battles. In one of them he was mortally wounded, and his death removed any obstacle that might otherwise have stood in the way of reunion.[1]

Bishop Wilmer's case.—The other incident was the consecration, during the interim, of the Right Rev. Richard Hooker Wilmer, D.D., as Bishop of Alabama, without the consent of the majority of the bishops. This action, while it did not invalidate his consecration, was yet contrary to the canons that were still considered in the North as binding on both sides of the lines. His acceptance as a bishop in good standing was still further rendered difficult by his promulgation of a pastoral letter in which he repudiated the military authority which had ordered him and his clergy to say the Prayer for the President of the United States.

Brotherly overtures.—Much anxiety was felt in regard to all these matters when the General Convention of 1865

[1] A Confederate chaplain has told the author that, during one of the most trying campaigns of the war, every general officer who had not been baptized received that Sacrament save one, who received it shortly after the war.

met, as it did by a happy coincidence, in Philadelphia, the City of Brotherly Love. Loving and fraternal messages had been exchanged between the two still excited sections, and efforts were made (largely under the leadership of the then presiding bishop, the Right Rev. Dr. Hopkins of Vermont) to induce the Southern bishops and others to attend the Convention. These overtures were not altogether unavailing, although not answered as widely as had been anticipated by some. The Bishop of North Carolina, the Right Rev. Thomas Atkinson, D.D., and the Right Rev. Henry C. Lay, D.D., Missionary Bishop of the South-west, were in attendance, as were a few deputies from North Carolina, Texas, and Tennesee, including from the last-named diocese the Rev. Charles Todd Quintard, D.D., who was consecrated bishop of that see early in the session.

The delicate position of Southern Churchmen.—The position of the Southern representatives, who had come against the advice of many in that section of the country, was one of great delicacy and perplexity. While not wishing to show any lack of appreciation of the extremely cordial and undoubtedly sincere language in which they had been invited, they did not wish, on the other hand, unnecessarily to wound the sensibilities of their brethren by any such action as might appear to reflect unduly upon a cause which the defeated combatants still maintained was lawful and right.

The Return of Bishops.—Naturally enough, therefore, the bishops especially were anxious to know upon what terms they would be received. Nothing more appropriate or convincing could have been framed than the message which the Bishop of New York was commissioned to convey to them—'to trust all to the love and honour of their brethren.' With this assurance, the two bishops entered the council of their colleagues, and were immediately convinced that they had made no mistake in coming.

Bishop Wilmer's case adjusted.—The matter of the consecration of Bishop Wilmer was soon adjusted by an agreement to accord him his full rights and prerogatives upon the presentation of his credentials and upon his

making, as early as might be convenient, the required promise of conformity before three other bishops. Action was also taken as to his obnoxious Pastoral Letter. In decided but fraternal language, its publication was regretted, and the belief was expressed that there would be no other occasion for similar regrets.

The effect of the Church's charity.—The proceedings of the Convention continued to be dominated to the very end by the same spirit of charity and self-respect. At times it looked as though some of the more uncompromising leaders would embarrass the action towards reunion in which the Church was plainly leading all other organisations. Indeed, the attention of the whole nation was directed to its deliberations on this reunion, as it was plainly recognised that the Convention was composed to a remarkable degree of representative men. The manner in which the whole matter was handled and finally settled not only gained for her the respect but also the accession of many belonging to other religious bodies, and served very largely towards the political reconstruction which afterwards ensued.

Renewal of ecclesiastical controversies.—It was not long after the happy settlement, so far as the Church was concerned, of national disputes, when ecclesiastical controversies were renewed, now chiefly concerning matters of ritual, especially as related to the doctrine and celebration of the Holy Communion. These did not involve at any time a question which has at times so much distracted the mother Church of England, the Eastward Position. Such a position has been maintained in certain parishes from time immemorial; and while no very great stress has been laid upon it, yet the author knows of no instance where it has occasioned any discussion.

The sessions of the General Conventions of 1868, 1871, and 1874 were largely occupied with very earnest debates as to the more elaborate ceremonial lately introduced, and the corresponding advance in doctrinal instruction. Many deprecated any legislation upon the subject, lest in such a period of development and excitement the Church might be committed to a formal expression of views which would be afterwards regretted.

Proposed prohibitions.—As an interesting and, in the light of subsequent events, rather amusing bit of the history of this period, it may be mentioned that a Committee of Bishops, among whom the High Churchmen were in the majority, recommended that the following things should be prohibited by canon:—the use of incense, the placing or retaining of a crucifix in any part of the church, the carrying of a cross in procession, the use of altar-lights except when necessary for illuminating purposes, the mixing of water and wine and the ablution of the altar-vessels in the sight of the congregation, and the assistance in any part of the Communion Office of any laymen. These recommendations, with others as to the length of cassock and surplice, colour of stoles, the introduction of choral services and surpliced choirs, failed to be approved by the Convention, which contented itself with passing a canon in 1874, by which it was made the duty of bishops to try any clergyman who might be presented to them for introducing unauthorised ceremonies or practices setting forth erroneous or doubtful doctrines, such as (*a*) the elevation of the Elements in the Holy Communion in such manner as to expose them to the view of the people as objects towards which adoration is to be made; (*b*) any act of adoration of or towards the Elements in the Holy Communion, such as bowings, prostrations, or genuflections; and (*c*) all other like acts not authorised by the rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer. This canon has never been repealed, but is practically a dead letter.

The Rev. Dr. De Koven's Speech.—One thing that contributed to make the canon a dead letter was a famous speech delivered at Baltimore in 1871 by the Rev. James De Koven, D.D., the great Warden of Racine College, Wisconsin, and a priest of great learning, eloquence, and influence. As he drew near the end of his memorable oration—it well deserved that name for its great power—he declared: 'I believe in "the Real, Actual Presence of our Lord under the form of bread and wine upon the altars of our Churches." I myself adore, and would, if it were necessary or my duty, "teach my people to adore Christ present in the elements under the

form of bread and wine." And I use those words,' he proceeded to say, 'because they are a bold statement of the doctrine of the Real Presence. But I use them for another reason: they are adjudicated words. They are words which, used by a divine of the Church of England,[1] have been tried in the highest ecclesiastical Court of England, and have been decided by that court to come within the limits of the truth held in the Church of England.' He ended his remarks by courting a trial, if any one thought him amenable to discipline by reason of what he had said.

His rejection and that of the Rev. Dr. Seymour.—The effect of his speech and of his bold challenge—a challenge which was never accepted—was almost indescribable upon the vast audience, and for some time after its delivery the Convention was almost too excited to proceed with the discussion. It was, however, well remembered against him; for when, in 1875, he was chosen Bishop of Illinois, he failed by a large majority to receive the necessary confirmation by the Standing Committees, just as the Rev. Dr. George F. Seymour (who belonged to the same school of theology, and was elected to the same see) had been rejected by the General Convention in 1874. It is a remarkable evidence of rapid growth in several directions that only four years later, when Dr. Seymour was elected to a new diocese (Springfield) formed out of Illinois, his confirmation, though hotly contested, was finally effected.

The Seminary at Nashotah.—Allusion must now be made to the Theological Seminary at Nashotah. The history of this institution belongs to the poetical and practical heroism of the American Church. It grew out of the missionary enthusiasm of some of the undergraduates of the General Theological Seminary, who were in the habit of meeting together to discuss the needs of the Church, and their own share of responsibility in supplying them. No one contributed more largely to these discussions than Arthur Cleveland Coxe, a man who, by his devout ardour, his versatility of talents and

[1] The Rev. W. J. E. Bennett, Vicar of Frome Selwood.

acquirements, and his personal charms, remained to the end of his life a conspicuous and influential Churchman, so recognised and honoured both in England and America.[1] The three members of the class of 1841 who more directly laid the foundations of the institution were William Adams, James Lloyd Breck, and John Henry Hobart, Bishop Hobart's son. A fourth student should be named, to whom, it is said, the idea of a religious house in the West first occurred—James Warley Miles, whose bishop, however, was not willing to give him up, thinking that he was just as much needed in South Carolina. Although Hobart was the first to reach the new field, and was very useful—especially in matters of business detail—he did not remain very long with his colleagues.

The plan now inaugurated had the warm approval of Professor Whittingham, at that time filling the chair of ecclesiastical history. The Domestic Committee of the Board of Missions sanctioned it unanimously, and agreed to pay the missionaries at the rate of two or three hundred dollars per annum.

The primitive conditions.—The primitive condition of the people may be imagined from a letter from Lloyd Breck to his brother, the Rev. Charles Breck, under date of April 5, 1842: 'You can have but little conception of the *sang froid* wherewith you will be showed to a bed to sleep in that is in the same room where all the rest of the family sleep. When I first came out, I felt awfully bad at such vile barbarities; but I am getting somewhat wild myself, and, following the example of my good Bishop, can carry on a conversation with the family after having gone to bed. Thus we live up to the principle of carrying out our churchmanship under every circumstance. When the Bishop last visited us, he once slept eight in a room, and the tattling old woman kept him awake a long time. What is civilising this land is neither Education nor Christianity, but the introduction of *sawmills*.'[2]

[1] Born 1818, died 1896. Bishop of Western New York, 1865-96.

[2] *Life of the Rev. James Lloyd Breck*, by the Rev. Charles Breck, D.D., pp. 28, 29.

Seminary life.—The members of the Association took possession in August 1842 of a tract of land about five hundred acres in extent, beautifully situated on the Nashotah (Indian for 'twin') Lakes. Very soon after settling there, they began the double work which was in their minds from the beginning. This was the ministering to the people in the neighbourhood as far as they could, and the training for Holy Orders of such poor young men as might come properly recommended. The quarters in which they lived contentedly were severely plain, and devoid of almost every comfort. Their fare was meagre; and the hardships which in many ways they endured, while labouring for their support and doing all manner of work, were of such a character as to have utterly disheartened them, had they not possessed a rare consecration of life. Eventually, many Churchmen came from the East to visit the institution, and were much impressed with its likeness to a real monastery. Indeed, it was named by some 'the Cluny of the American Church.' While there were no formal monastic vows, the life there was practically in accordance with them. Daily Morning and Evening Prayer, with at least weekly Eucharists, were among the features of the spiritual life there, which features in those days were very rare in America.

Effects of the work.—Such consecration began ere long to tell in the two directions already mentioned. Many devoted adherents to the Church were now among the new settlers in those wild regions, and the number of prospective clergymen grew rapidly. Breck had been chosen Head of the House, and remained in that position until 1853, when **the Rev. Dr. Cole** was chosen in his stead, continuing in this position, which he filled admirably, until his death in 1885. **The Rev. Dr. Adams** was a moving spirit early associated with the work there, and remaining one of the professors until he died in 1897. A man of many gifts, and of simple, heroic character, he wielded (both at Nashotah and, gradually, in the Church at large) a strong influence in the direction of really Catholic doctrine. He was of great service in days which soon became a period of suspicion and unrest, contemporaneous as they were with the secession

of John Henry Newman. His chief textbook was Pearson on the Creed, an ounce of which, he used to say, was worth a pound of Paley.

Breck's removal to Minnesota.—Some changes having occurred at Nashotah, altering the plan as originally devised by Breck, he deemed it best to withdraw and establish somewhere else his cherished Associate Mission, the idea of which he would appear to have inaugurated, so far as the American Church is concerned. Accordingly, he removed to Minnesota in 1850, and began anew his frontier missionary work at Crow Wing, chiefly among the Indians of that region. He had as his first fellow-labourers there the Rev. Timothy Wilcoxson of Connecticut and the Rev. John Austin Merrick of Philadelphia. The record of their work in that country is one of great courage, hardness of trial, and unselfish enthusiasm, and of substantial gains both among the white and the red people. Among permanent results may be reckoned the Divinity School and other educational establishments now so prosperous at Faribault, Minnesota, whose growth in these later days has been owing very largely, under God, to the zeal and offices of Bishop Whipple. He bears this testimony to Breck's character and work: 'We who knew him well will love his memory more as the years go by. You do not know how I miss him. I owe God a deep debt of gratitude for giving me such a pioneer to lay foundations.'[1]

His removal to Benicia.—Breck's missionary spirit was not to be satisfied until he could reach the utmost limits of the wide country which he loved so well, and in 1867 he was the prime mover in inaugurating (as was formally done in impressive services held in the Church of the Holy Communion, New York, October 9 and 10) the 'Associate Mission of the Pacific Coast.' It was composed of the Rev. Messrs. Breck, Merrick, James H. Smith, and Enoch C. Cowan. They made choice of Benicia, California, where they eventually started St. Augustine's College and Grammar School, with a Divinity Hall attached, and St. Mary's School. Although there

[1] *Life of Dr. Breck*, p. xi.

was reason to make the lamentation (too common, alas!) as to the tardiness of the Church in entering new fields—to which remissness may be attributed much of her slow growth at the outset of some of her missionary enterprises—the progress of the new institutions in California was quite remarkable, even in that land of quick developments. At the end of three years, the value of real estate and improvements was $40,000. While hopeful of still greater growth, Dr. Breck died in 1876, leaving behind him a splendid example of true missionary spirit and zeal.

Baptismal Regeneration Controversy.—For a number of years not a few of the clergy and laity had their misgivings—honest enough, however unnecessary—as to the use of the word 'regenerate' in the baptismal office, and wished in some way to limit or define its significance. With a view to settling their difficulties and guarding the Church from a threatened schism, the House of Bishops in 1871, in a Declaration signed by forty-eight out of fifty-three members, expressed its opinion that the word is not so used in this place 'as to determine that a moral change in the subject of Baptism is wrought in the Sacrament.'

This rather ambiguous utterance was the means of quieting the minds of some; but there were restless and turbulent spirits who were ready enough to take advantage of other causes and follow the guidance of any determined leader in precipitating the schism which had been so much in the air.

The Rev. Dr. Cummins and his Schism.—This leader was found in the person of the Right Rev. Dr. George D. Cummins, who had for seven years been the assistant Bishop of Kentucky. With much vehemence, and with some effect, owing to his eloquence, he had denounced what he considered wrong and misleading in the Prayer Book, and in the services of so-called 'Ritualistic' churches. Disregarding all advice, and bent upon an immediate adoption of his revolutionary schemes, he issued a summons (under date of November 13, 1873) for a convention of all who sympathised with him in his desire and intention to form an Episcopal Church on the

basis of the proposed and rejected Prayer Book of 1785. This organisation was effected on the second of the following December, under the name of the 'Reformed Episcopal Church.'

The Rev. Charles E. Cheney's Deposition.—Dr. Cummins was chosen its Presiding Bishop, and within less than a fortnight he went through the form of consecrating as bishop the Rev. Charles E. Cheney, a clergyman of Chicago, deposed in 1871 by the then Bishop of Illinois, the Right Rev. Dr. Whitehouse, who, if he had been as conciliatory and tactful as he was brave and able, might possibly have averted some of the consequences of his presbyter's plainly unlawful and contumacious acts. Associated with these two recusant ministers in the beginning, and with the movement at other periods of its history, were several clergymen who had been deposed for various offences, not merely ecclesiastical. Its course has been marked, of necessity, by inconsistency and internal differences, and now, at the end of nearly thirty years' existence, gives but little evidence of vitality and growth. Frequently its members, both ministers and laymen, realising how far short it comes of meeting their wants and expectations, seek their fulfilment in 'the old Church' from which this sad departure was made. It is devoutly to be hoped that ere long there may be an honourable reunion in the total disappearance of the schismatical body.

Deposition of Bishop Cummins.—Of course, the unlawful action of Bishop Cummins was not overlooked. He was first notified that, unless within six months from the date of this communication (November 2, 1873) from the Bishop of Kentucky, the Right Rev. Benjamin Bosworth Smith, D.D.,[1] he gave evidence that he had not abandoned the Communion of the Church, he would be deposed from the ministry. His intervening actions made it unnecessary to await the expiration of this term. On the first of December he was presented for trial and notified of this act, being also informed that any episcopal

[1] Bishop Smith's episcopate was the longest of any American bishop thus far, reaching (at the time of his death in his ninetieth year) fifty-one years and seven months.

act of his during the interim would be null and void. On the twelfth day of that month (the day before his 'consecration' of Dr. Cheney) the Bishop of Kentucky withdrew from him all such episcopal authority as he had hitherto granted him. On St. John Baptist's Day, 1874, the Presiding Bishop, with the consent of a majority of all the bishops, deposed him. This action was ratified in the following October by the House of Bishops duly assembled. Since that unhappy period, the exterior life of the Church has been but little disturbed, and the voice of controversy seldom heard within its councils or among its members.

CHAPTER VIII

MISSIONS

Missions to Africa.—Abroad, the earliest efforts were directed to the evangelisation of Africa, to whose western coast the Rev. Joseph R. Andrews (or Andrus) sailed in the spring of 1821. Shortly afterwards, the Rev. Lot Jones was appointed to Buenos Ayres, but was hindered from going by circumstances beyond his control. The Rev. Jacob Oson, a coloured man of repute, died on the eve of his sailing to Africa in 1828.

Early Coloured Clergymen and Parishes.—Other coloured men had been ordained, the first of whom is believed to have been the Rev. Absalom Jones, a native of Sussex County, Delaware, who in 1795 was enrolled among the clergy belonging to the diocese of Pennsylvania. He was then a deacon in charge of the parish known as 'the African Church of St. Thomas,' Philadelphia, which was, doubtless, the first organised parish of its kind in the United States. The parish of St. Philip, New York, was not founded until 1818. The Philadelphia parish, although founded in 1793, was not admitted into union with the Convention of Pennsylvania, with the right to send coloured delegates, until 1864.[1] For years, even in a state where slavery had not existed for generations, such was the prejudice against the race that the proposition to admit these delegates gave rise to heated and almost angry discussions, participated in on either

[1] The author attended many of these sessions, and can easily recall the excitement over a question which could not now cause a moment's controversy in Pennsylvania, however much it might yet prove a firebrand in some other dioceses.

side by the most eminent members of a body otherwise distinguished by great charity and religious zeal.[1]

Missions to the East.—The noble manner in which the inhabitants of classic Greece had freed themselves from the hateful and degrading tyranny of the Turks had aroused much chivalrous enthusiasm in the United States, and it was not long before some of its citizens were moved to inaugurate a mission for their benefit. Foremost among these was the Rev. John J. Robertson of Maryland, who was authorised by the Society in the spring of 1829 to go and make some preliminary investigations. He returned full of ardour, and eager to go with companions to carry out plans which he had already formed, of helping the Greeks, not to the formation of a new Church, but (chiefly by means of printing-presses and schools) to a clearer and fuller appreciation of the Catholic principles held in common by both parties.

Dr. Robertson, Dr. Hill, and Greece.—In October of the same year he went back, with the Rev. John H. Hill and his wife, and Mr. Solomon Bingham. The instructions given them by the authorities at home were explicit, and left no room for doubt as to the due regard which was to be paid to the ecclesiastical status of these fellow-members of the Universal Church. The general lack of education in the country, and the admirable manner in which the American schools were conducted, soon brought them a large number of pupils, both girls and boys. The confidence and regard of the nation followed, and have never been withdrawn. Amid continuous tokens of approval and grateful appreciation, both from ecclesiastical and civil dignitaries, the institutions founded by them are still pursuing their useful course.

Missions to China.—The vision of some members of the young American Church embraced all parts of the world in their missionary schemes; and various heathen nations and races were suggested as special objects of their prayers and alms—among them, China, Cochin China, Siam, and Burmah. It was thought best, however, to concentrate on

[1] Bishop Kemper, while young in his Philadelphian ministry, preached there regularly, and was always a most welcome visitor.

one country, and China was selected. Although not allowed by his failing health to go in person, the Rev. Augustus Foster Lyde, of the class of 1834 in the General Theological Seminary, may, by reason of his earnest advocacy of the cause—to which he had in heart wholly dedicated his unusual talents and ability—be justly considered the first missionary to this great empire. The first who actually went thither, in 1835, was the Rev. Henry Lockwood, of the same Seminary, who had as his fellow-labourer the Rev. Francis R. Hanson, of the Virginia Theological Seminary. Abiding in Batavia, Java, until a favourable opportunity presented itself, they began their Chinese work near Amoy. The daughter Church was, as to this particular field, in advance of her English mother by nearly forty years.

Bishop for Africa.—It was early felt by many that the true method of founding missions in new territory was by means of a local episcopate. It was determined in 1837 to send a bishop to Africa, but it was difficult to agree upon an available priest who was deemed qualified for this work and field. While delaying action in this direction, steps were taken to supply a bishop for China, and a suitable person was found in one of the missionaries labouring there, the Rev. William J. Boone, who was consecrated in 1844, and very soon returned to the field from which he had been called for this purpose.

Bishop Southgate's Mission to the East.—Almost simultaneously with his departure, another bishop, the Right Rev. Dr. Horatio Southgate, went with a commission to labour in the territory which was then known as 'the Dominions and Dependencies of the Sultan of Turkey,' which comprised, in addition to Turkey itself, the Holy Land, Egypt, and North Africa as far as Algiers. His work was of a very delicate nature; and because of the scrupulous way in which he endeavoured to fulfil his commission without doing violence to the Catholic principles involved, he always lacked that general support which was essential to the entire success of his well-directed efforts. These were not, however, unfruitful. They continued for more than five years, during a part of which he had the assistance not only

of a devoted and gifted wife, but also of the Rev. John J. Robertson, D.D., a man of like enthusiasm and unselfish diligence.

To their labours we may attribute the better understanding as to the American Church which early prevailed among the Oriental prelates and others, who had been, not unnaturally, prejudiced against her by the methods and principles of other American missionaries of various names, who had undertaken a course of promiscuous proselytising. With Bishop Southgate's return to the United States for the purpose of making better arrangements for his mission, it practically died, although the Board of Missions had voted to continue it.[1]

Mission to Japan.—Many earnest hearts had desired for years to see Japan evangelised; but their hopes were not realised until 1858, when, owing first to the sagacious manner in which, six years before, Commodore Perry (a Churchman) had opened the way by his exploring expedition, and to the equally conciliatory methods later employed by the United States Consul, Townsend Harris, the inhabitants of this land were fully persuaded of the kindly intentions of the American missionaries. It was in 1859 that the American Church sent her first heralds there in the persons of the Rev. Channing M. Williams and the Rev. John Liggins. The former returned home in 1866, at which time he was consecrated Bishop of China and Japan. For a while he divided his labours between the two countries; but in 1874 they were made separate jurisdictions, and he became the first Bishop of Yedo. He remained in charge of this field until 1889, when his resignation was regretfully accepted. He has, however, continued to labour there uninterruptedly, adding to the already large debt of gratitude owing to one to whom more than to any one else, under God, is due the honour of refounding Christianity in Japan. For years he laboured amidst much suspicion and enmity, fomented all the more by the occasional issue of formal

[1] Bishop Southgate, after holding several parochial cures, died in Astoria, New York, April 12, 1894, in the eighty-second year of his age. At this time he was by consecration the oldest bishop in the American Church.

edicts against it. His first baptism did not take place until he had been preaching for seven years. Much of his time was occupied in translating various parts of the Bible and Prayer Book. Similar work was done in China by his successor in the episcopate there, the Right Rev. Samuel I. J. Schereschewsky, D.D., who, after seven years of efficient work, was obliged to resign from ill-health in 1884. Upon his return to the United States, he resumed as best he could his work of translating the Holy Scriptures into the Mandarin language, for which difficult task he was well fitted by reason of his eminent abilities. To prosecute it still further, and to render any other aid within his power, he has, although severely crippled by disease, heroically gone again to China, and will there end his days.

In Japan there are now two missionary jurisdictions of the American Church, each with its bishop, namely, Tokio and Kioto.

To Africa.—While Africa was the first of the foreign fields for which a bishop was intended, it was not until 1851 that the design was consummated in the consecration of the Rev. John Payne, D.D., who had been zealously labouring there for over fifteen years. He died in 1874. The present bishop there is the Right Rev. Samuel D. Ferguson, D.D., a coloured man, consecrated in 1885. The operations of the American Church have been confined mostly to the coast region of Western Africa, in the neighbourhood of Cape Palmas. Among the earliest friends of this mission were the Rev. John A. Vaughan, D.D. (a godly priest of Philadelphia), and his devoted wife. Their name was given to one of its original sites.

To Haiti.—In 1874 another coloured priest, the Rev. James T. Holly, was consecrated bishop and sent to Haiti, where he had been faithfully ministering amid many difficulties since the year 1861. While there is no civil affiliation between the two countries, yet the Church in America has for a long time afforded the sister republic considerable aid in various ways as to spiritual things. Bishop Lee of Delaware made, in 1865, the first episcopal visitation of which there is any record.

Bishops for Negroes and Indians.—From time to time arguments have been urged for the appointment of bishops exclusively for the negroes and the Indians. They have never prevailed so far as the negroes are concerned, for various reasons—chiefly on account of the strong probability of complications arising out of already existing diocesan relations. They were more successful for a while as concerns the Indians. As early as 1844 it was proposed to raise a certain sum for the endowment of such an episcopate, but nothing came of the suggestion. Thirty years later, chiefly through the indefatigable efforts of Mr. William Welsh of Philadelphia —one of the most zealous and liberal laymen of his day —the Rev. William Hobart Hare was consecrated, with the title of Missionary Bishop of Niobrara, and his field was designated among the Indians, principally in what was then the territory of Dakota. Subsequently his jurisdiction was divided, and no one bishop is now accounted as especially charged with the evangelisation of the Indians, who are to be found in large numbers in several jurisdictions, whose bishops are always most careful as to the spiritual needs of these wards of the American Republic. Many of the Indians have become clergymen, who as to loyalty and consistency will compare most favourably with their white brethren. Among their most devoted friends must be mentioned the Right Rev. Henry B. Whipple, D.D., Bishop of Minnesota, who, from the beginning of his episcopate in 1859, not only always manifested the greatest interest in their welfare, but also braved almost every peril in their behalf, especially in exposing and endeavouring to thwart the wily and wicked schemes of politicians and corrupt contractors.

Care for Negroes.—While there has been, perhaps, more of general interest in the missionary efforts among the Indians—partly, no doubt, from the romance attaching to them, and to the consciousness of the many and grievous wrongs inflicted upon them—than in similar efforts for the negroes, there have been many and continuous labours and gifts for the spiritual advancement of the negroes. Dating back to the earliest days of the

colonial period, these labours have been a prominent feature of Church-work in every part of the country. Of course they predominated in the slave-states, in which the number of negroes was so very large, and where many negroes belonged to members of the Church, among whom were several bishops. One of these (the Right Rev. Dr. Polk, Bishop of Louisiana) owned at one time not less than four hundred slaves. While there were many instances of cruelty and indifference to their souls, there were also many other instances of the greatest kindness and interest in their religious education. A prominent layman of Mississippi (Dr. William Newton Mercer, living in the neighbourhood of Natchez), who owned a thousand slaves, built for their exclusive benefit a stone chapel costing $20,000 and a rectory costing $8000, and provided a chaplain, to whom he paid a salary of $1200 a year. The occurrence and consequences of the Civil War of 1861-65 very much hindered the Church's work in this direction, and even now it receives but scanty support as compared with its real merits and requirements. Since 1866 it has formed the exclusive object of the labours of a Joint Commission of clergymen and laymen, constituted by the General Convention.

Missions to the Jews.—It was not until the middle of the nineteenth century that the number of Jews was realised to have become so considerable in the United States as to demand a special movement for Christianising them. Since then, various organisations have endeavoured to accomplish this difficult work; but the general co-operation has not been such as its nature has a right to exact.

To Foreign Nationalities.—The various foreign nationalities represented to any large extent in the United States, such as the French, German, and Italian, have attracted the particular attention of the Church, as shown in the translation of the Prayer Book into their vernacular, and the erection of churches especially for them, or, where this has not been practicable, the holding of special services for their benefit.

CHAPTER IX

EDUCATION AND PROGRESS

Early Educational Movements.—Churchmen early recognised the necessity of combining general education with instruction of a more distinctly religious and ecclesiastical character. Mention has already been made of the early establishment of William and Mary College. Since then, a considerable number of Church colleges and schools have been established. In many instances they have flourished for a time, and then have been allowed either wholly to disappear or to continue in a precarious condition. Money enough has been lavished by Churchmen upon other institutions of learning to have made their own equal to any in the land. A like complaint may be made as to patronage. If the sons of Churchmen now undergraduates in the various universities and colleges were members of the distinctively ecclesiastical institutions of the same kind, their prosperity and reputation would be immeasurably advanced.

Columbia and Lehigh Universities.—Among the older foundations allied in a way to the Church is Columbia University (formerly King's College), New York. It is not in any very specific manner related to the Church, except through the requirement that the President shall always be a communicant of the Church, and that the prayers in the chapel shall always be taken from the Liturgy of the Church of England. On these conditions, the grant of real estate for endowment was made by the corporation of Trinity Church, New York, many years ago, and they have always been considered binding upon the Board of Trustees. This helps, at least, to

make the tone of the University Christian, and measurably Churchly. Lehigh University, South Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, founded in 1865 through the munificent gifts of Asa Packer of Mauch Chunk, is, at his suggestion, under the auspices of the Church.

Trinity College and other Institutions.—Much more definite relations to the Church exist in the case of Trinity College, Hartford (the successor in 1845 of Washington College, chartered in 1823); Kenyon College, Ohio (founded in 1828); Hobart College, Geneva, New York (inaugurated first as an academy in 1811); the University of the South at Sewanee, Tennessee; and St. Stephen's College, Annandale, New York, founded in 1860. The scholarship in these institutions is high; and when Churchmen put more into practice the theories of education to which they are of necessity committed, their growth will be more assured. The lack of more definite religious and Churchly instruction in other colleges and universities is partly supplied by societies composed of the members of the Church among their undergraduates, and by the erection of suitable halls where they may congregate and receive such instruction.

St. Paul's and other Church Schools—The Rev. Dr. H. A. Coit.—Throughout the country, in more than twenty dioceses, there are many preparatory Church schools, both for boys and girls. The great majority are very successful in every way, and form an invaluable link between the family training and the collegiate or university life. Among those who most keenly appreciated this relation, and did very much towards realising it among his pupils, was the Rev. Henry A. Coit, D.D., (1831-95), who was the first, and up to the time of his death the only, headmaster of St. Paul's School, Concord, New Hampshire, founded in 1856 by Dr. George C. Shattuck of Boston. It is difficult to measure the influence of such men upon the character of those who are so directly moulded by them in the formative periods of their lives.

Theological Seminaries.—In the United States, where so large a proportion of those seeking Holy Orders have been and still are deprived of the advantages of a

collegiate or university education, it has been felt to be additionally important that they should have elsewhere the benefit of some special training before entering upon the work of the sacred ministry. As early as 1814, the necessity of establishing a theological seminary was brought to the notice of the General Convention, and favourable action concerning it was taken at the following Convention in 1817. A small beginning was made the same year in New York, with six students, under the instructions of Professors Samuel F. Jarvis and Samuel H. Turner, the latter remaining in the same work until his death in 1861.

The General Seminary.—In 1820 this Seminary was removed, by vote of the General Convention, to New Haven, Connecticut, but returned to New York by the same authority in 1822, thereby availing itself of a legacy of $60,000 from Mr. Jacob Sherred. It was consolidated with a diocesan school that had been for a short time in operation; and the number of students with which what was now and has ever since been known as the General Theological Seminary began its memorable career was twenty-three. A large and eligible plot of ground, situated originally in the suburbs of the city, but now in its lower parts, although still admirably adapted for its purpose, was generously given by a resident of the neighbourhood, Mr. Clement C. Moore, son of the Bishop of New York, and familiarly known to generations of children as the author of the ballad 'Twas the night before Christmas.' Its seat (Chelsea Square) is now occupied by a group of buildings which, in architectural appearance and in adaptation to their uses, rank among the best of such structures in the country. Munificent gifts have been bestowed upon the Seminary of late years.

Dean Hoffman.—Among the benefactors none deserves a higher rank, both because of his pecuniary donations and of his unremitting efforts for its efficiency in every direction, than the Rev. Eugene Augustus Hoffman, D.D., D.C.L., who in A.D. 1879 became the honoured Dean of the Seminary. In endowments, lands, and buildings, the value of its property may now be reckoned

at not less than $4,500,000. It has matriculated (up to September 1900) in all 2324 students, of whom fifty-two have become bishops; the number under instruction in 1899-1900 was 127, representing forty dioceses.

The Virginia Seminary.—This latter fact, in addition to other features that might be cited, amply justifies its retention of the title 'General.' Yet the exigencies of the Church seem to have demanded from time to time the founding of similar institutions in other parts of the country, until to-day there are no less than fourteen of them scattered from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The oldest and most prominent of them is the Theological Seminary of Virginia, located near Washington, whose honourable history since its opening in 1823 is largely connected with the best members and life of the Church. It has always been distinguished for the zeal which its students have exhibited in behalf of foreign missions. Its graduates now number nearly a thousand, of whom twenty-seven have been made bishops, and more than fifty have gone abroad as foreign missionaries.

Sunday Schools.—Sunday schools have, from an early date, formed a prominent feature in the religious education of America. It is thought that the first one may have been established by John Wesley in Savannah. They existed as early as 1783 in Christ Church, Philadelphia. For the greater part of the past century they have been composed of all classes in the community, and so in many instances they number hundreds of scholars. Those of St. George's Church, New York, and of the Mission attached to the Episcopal Hospital, Philadelphia, are perhaps the largest in the country, each of them numbering in all, including teachers and pupils, over 2300 members.

Parish Schools and Common Schools.—What adds to the great importance of these schools and to other institutions for the same purpose is the almost total absence of parish schools. There are many dioceses where not one exists; and in the few where there are any, their number and influence are small. This condition of affairs may be accounted for on several grounds. At the root of the evil lies the common apathy as to Christian

and ecclesiastical education. Then the common or public schools, supported by the rates, have, as a rule, the confidence of the community at large as to their sufficiency. In addition, there is a reluctance on the part of some who seek popularity for political purposes to array themselves against what is thought to be so distinctively an American institution. All this militates against the success of parish schools, which are considered by many so essential to the thorough and permanent evangelisation of the land. As showing the importance attached to them by the vestry of Trinity Church, New York, it may be mentioned that the annual appropriations in this direction amount to more than $22,000 in addition to an expenditure of nearly $6500 on night, industrial, cooking, and laundry schools. In the day schools of this parish, including the Kindergartens, there are thirty-five teachers and about a thousand scholars.

The Rev. Charles F. Hoffman.—Feeling keenly the necessity of doing something to arouse greater interest in this whole subject, and also with the view of raising the intellectual standard of such institutions, the Rev. Charles F. Hoffman, D.D., founded in 1896 the 'Association for Promoting the Interests of Church Schools, Colleges, and Seminaries.' By means of gifts, loans, and liberal prizes, this Association is materially aiding the cause of Christian education.

Trinity Church, New York.—Not a few of the institutions now under review owe much of their prosperity to a corporation which on many accounts deserves especial mention in such a history as this—that of Trinity Church, New York. It was chartered in 1692, and at the same time endowed with a grant of land, which in succeeding years became very valuable. An appropriation was also made of £100 out of the public funds, for the support of the rector, who was styled 'the Minister of the city of New York.' This is a title which may be still unhesitatingly given to the rector of a parish which, by reason of its resource and the manner in which its responsibilities have always been discharged, and the character borne by its several rectors, stands to-day as the foremost parish of the country.

The Rev. Dr. Dix.—To none of its rectors is this more applicable than to the present incumbent, the Rev. Morgan Dix, D.D.[1] As an illustration of the labours of thought and oversight belonging to this rectorship, it may be mentioned that, in addition to the parish church with its staff of clergy, there are in various parts of the city eight chapels with over twenty clergymen attached to them.

The wealth of the parish in real estate and other endowments is very large; and yet the conscientious manner in which it has been administered, and the generous disposition of its income, has made Churchmen everywhere grateful for such a potent agency in religious and charitable work. One of its charities, very common in England, but almost alone in America, is the weekly dole of bread given at St. John's Chapel, under the provisions of a bequest of £1000 by Mr. John Leake, whose name is associated with that of Mr. John Watts and his son Robert, in a flourishing Orphan Asylum for boys.

Revision of the Prayer Book.—With the advancing education of the times, it is not surprising that eventually the desire should grow for a revision of the Prayer Book which should make it more in keeping with the best ideas of liturgical requirements. It encountered at once almost insurmountable opposition, born out of reverent regard for the existing manual, and an irrepressible dread as to the outcome of an uncertain handling of that precious volume.

Finally, however, in 1880, such opposition was so far overcome as to allow a joint committee of the two Houses of the General Convention to be appointed to consider whether 'the changed conditions of the national life do not demand certain alterations in the Book of Common Prayer, in the direction of liturgical enrichment and increased flexibility of use.' This was by no means approved by a unanimous vote, there being many who, while they were in favour of liturgical enrichment, were

[1] The high regard in which Dr. Dix is held generally is evidenced by the fact that for five successive General Conventions he has been chosen President of the House of Deputies—for four of them unanimously.

somewhat suspicious of the phrase 'increased flexibility of use.'

Assurances were given by those chiefly concerned in promoting this movement that led the Church at large to believe that no radical change would be proposed. To this effect the Committee appointed at once pledged themselves, agreeing (1) that no alterations should be proposed affecting either statements or standards of doctrine already in force, and (2) that in all proposals of alteration the then existing principles of liturgical construction and ritual should be followed.

Under these conservative limitations the Committee began their work. As it progressed, it attracted increased attention, and the best minds of the Church were occupied in its execution. For several General Conventions it was the most important matter under discussion. Ample opportunity was given to all persons interested to add their contributions of suggestion or objection; and while, of course, in the end there were the regrets on either side as to what had been altered and inserted and what had not been changed or adopted, there was yet a ready and almost universal acceptance of the completed work, as one that had distinctly added to the value and usefulness of a book already so much endeared to all.

The happy spirit attending the Revision.—It is most gratifying to record the entire absence during the protracted debate of all merely controversial argument, and of all desire for merely partisan advantage. It was not until 1892 that final measures were adopted by which the Revised Prayer Book became the only authorised standard of public worship and doctrine—to remain unaltered, it is believed, for another century.

The Chief Changes.—The Prayer Book set forth and ratified in 1789 was substantially the same as that of the Church of England, it being, according to the language of the Preface, far from the intention of the American Church 'to depart from the Church of England in any essential point of doctrine, discipline, or worship, or further than local circumstances require.' Accordingly the changes, beyond the substitution of more modern language for some obsolete words and phrases, were

chiefly such as were demanded by the new political relations of the country; some few things were either abridged or left out entirely, without any doctrinal significance being attached to such action. The additions made, such as the forms for Consecration of Churches, Institution of Ministers, and for Thanksgiving Day, were in accordance with the suggestions of common experience.

In the late revision, some of the original omissions were supplied, and some of the changed language restored to the original form. The most notable and welcome addition was that of the Feast of the Transfiguration (August 6), with its proper collect, epistle, and gospel. The gains also included the insertion of the *Magnificat* and *Nunc Dimittis*, of additional versicles in Evening Prayer, of special prayers for Unity, Missions, Rogation Days, etc., and of a second collect, epistle, and gospel for Christmas Day and Easter Day.

As to 'flexibility of use,' the revision permitted discreet abbreviations in Morning and Evening Prayer and in the Communion Office.

The Chief Contributors.—By those acquainted with the prolonged history of the movement, it will not be deemed invidious to mention particularly three members of the Committee who, in a marked way, contributed so largely to the general result—the Right Rev. William C. Doane, D.D.,[1] the Rev. Samuel Hart, D.D., and the Rev. William R. Huntington, D.D.

The Hymnal as now in use.—In 1871 a new Hymnal was adopted, which comprised in all five hundred and twenty hymns, including what were thought to be the best of the selections of Psalms and of the hymns in the former collection, with quite a number of new hymns. This was again altered in 1874, and more radically in 1892 and 1895, at which latter date the Hymnal now in use was finally adopted. No other can be used authoritatively.

[1] To this eminent prelate, consecrated in 1869 Bishop of the newly-formed see of Albany, the American Church owes very much for the unwearied diligence with which, in so many directions, he has devoted to her benefit and renown his many and varied gifts and acquirements. He is a son of Bishop George W. Doane.

At various times, efforts were ineffectually made to allow the use in public of the English collection known as 'Hymns Ancient and Modern.'

In the original collection, the hymns numbered only twenty-seven. In 1808, thirty were added. In the present one, there are six hundred and seventy-nine. They are not allowed to be bound up with the Prayer Book. Owing to a fear of opening the door to more important changes, it was not until the revision of the Prayer Book in 1892 that the Psalms were pointed with the musical colon. In 1895, permission was given to a Commission to set forth a pointing for the Canticles in Morning and Evening Prayer, with the authority to print it as an appendix to the Hymnal.

Choir Controversies.—Some time elapsed after the revival of choirs of men and boys (largely due to the example and influence of the Rev. Dr. Muhlenberg of New York) before they wore anything during service except their ordinary garments. The wearing by them of any kind of surplice was looked upon by some bishops as a violation of law, and in one notable instance—as late as 1871—a clergyman of the diocese of Ohio was presented for trial by his diocesan, Bishop M'Ilvaine, because he had declined at his request to disband a surpliced choir and give up processional singing. While the trial was postponed several times, the clergyman finally yielded, under protest, to his bishop's demands.[1]

Later arrangements.—During the past ten years, women have been added—sometimes even in preponderating numbers—to such choirs, with vestments. These are sometimes such as may be properly classed as belonging to women, and sometimes as so similar to those worn by men and boys, as justly to cause much unfavourable comment and episcopal prohibition.

Organisation of Women.—During these late years the absence of little controversy and partisan legislation has

[1] This priest (the Rev. Colin C. Tate), then Rector of St. Paul's Church, Columbus, did not so much contend, during the two or three years of proceedings, for the vested choir, etc., as for the law of the Church and the rights of the clergy. Pending the trial, he was deprived of his seat in the diocesan convention.

been favourable to the growth of the Church's spiritual life, which in turn has demanded for its expression in a practical way the more systematic organisation of men and women for works of benevolence and charity. The first attempt was made among the women; and the rather rapid multiplication, after a certain experimental period, of sisterhoods, deaconesses, and other kindred associations affords ample proof of the ripeness of the time. The initial movement may be traced back to 1845, when the Rev. Dr. Muhlenberg organised, under rather flexible rules, what was known as the Sisterhood of the Holy Communion. At the present time (1906) there are no less than twenty different sisterhoods at work, including three branches of English communities. Deaconesses are established in several dioceses, with training-schools in almost every instance. Their order was first established by the Rev. Horace Stringfellow in 1855, with the cordial concurrence of his diocesan, Bishop Whittingham of Maryland. While the sisterhoods are exempt from any canonical legislation concerning them, deaconesses are expressly included in such provisions.

In addition to these more formal organisations, there are several others which are widely spread throughout the country, and are the means of accomplishing great good for the Church. Chief among these are the Women's Auxiliary, the Girls' Friendly Society, and the Daughters of the King.[1]

Organisation of Men.—Several religious orders have been established for priests and laymen, in addition to the 'Society of the Mission Priests of St. John the Evangelist,' founded at Cowley, in England, 1865, established in the United States 1872. These are the Order of the Holy Cross (founded in 1881), the Order of the Brothers of Nazareth (founded in 1886), the Congregation of the Companions of the Holy Saviour, the Order of the Good Shepherd, and the Society of the Atonement (founded in 1899).

The Brotherhood of St. Andrew.—Besides these, there are

[1] The last-named, founded in 1885, does for women what the Brotherhood of St. Andrew does for men. In 1906 it comprised 864 chapters and over 18,500 members.

guilds and societies of various kinds and for specific purposes, which are very effectually contributing their share to the general result. The most prominent and influential of them all is the Brotherhood of St. Andrew (organised as a parochial society in 1883, as a national one in 1886, through the agency of James L. Houghteling, an earnest Chicago layman), which numbers 1240 chapters and over 14,000 members. It is especially and exclusively for the spread of Christ's kingdom among men, particularly the younger men. Its rules of prayer and rule of service are the only binding obligations. It has already proved a valuable help wherever it has been faithfully tried.

The Church Temperance Society.—The cause of Temperance, as taught in the Holy Scriptures, is enforced by the Church Temperance Society, organised, in 1881, upon the same double basis as that of the Church of England Temperance Society.

The Church Congress.—As an illustration of the intellectual life of the Church, the establishment in 1874 of the Church Congress may be cited. It is, as in England, altogether an unofficial organisation, which has not as yet obtained such a standing as there. In the presence of so many other opportunities in America for such discussions as belong to it, there is not enough consciousness of the need of a Church Congress to make it altogether successful.

Cathedrals.—In other respects, the daughter Church has been, perhaps, slow to imitate her English mother. This is so, for example, as to cathedrals, which are to-day found in not more than forty dioceses, and in some of these they are still little better than parish churches; in a yet larger number of them the English organisation as to deans and chapters is wanting. The cathedral at Faribault, Minnesota, was the first building of the kind erected (under Bishop Whipple in 1862), as it was also the first in which a weekly celebration of the Holy Communion was established. While many of these edifices are stately and complete, those at Albany and New York correspond more than any others to the ideas associated with such buildings.

The Provincial System.—As to the adoption of the

Provincial System, the American Church has been still slower to follow the precedents elsewhere set. Indeed, there is but one province actually established, that of Illinois, comprising the three dioceses within that state. In the state of New York, there is a Federate Council, which seldom or never meets, but is supposed to have some relation to a future province for the five dioceses already contained within that territory.

Free and Open Churches.—The growth in the number of churches with free and unappropriated sittings has been very remarkable. It is not certain when or where the system was first put into operation; probably St. Mark's Church, Lewistown, Pennsylvania, as early at least as 1823. At first its advocates encountered not a little opposition, and even yet they are not without controversy, howbeit kindly and fraternal. But such has been the change in sentiment in regard to the matter, that in the year 1906, 84½ per cent. of all the churches do not rent pews or sittings. In at least six dioceses all of the churches are free. Much of this change may be attributed to the work and influence of the Free and Open Church Association, founded in Philadelphia in the year 1875 by a few earnest clergymen and laymen, and modelled upon the plan of its English namesake.

The Movement for Christian Unity.—From the beginning of the American Church, she has felt her mission to unify Christianity for the vast population inhabiting the region where she was so early planted. Every year demonstrates more clearly that she is better fitted for this grand work than any other religious body. For more than a century she has put forth various efforts in this direction.[1] In 1856 a Commission on Church Unity was chosen by the House of Bishops. In 1886, at the

[1] At the General Convention in 1792, the House of Bishops, upon the motion of Bishop Madison, adopted a declaration expressive of their readiness and anxiety to favour such conferences with members of other religious bodies as might tend to bring about 'that union for which our Lord and Saviour so earnestly prayed.' The House of Deputies by a decided vote disagreed with the proposition 'as tending to produce distrust of the stability of the system of the Episcopal Church, without the least prospect of embracing any other religious body.'

request of the House of Deputies, there was appointed a Joint Commission on the same subject, which still exists. Its province is to enter into conference with any or all of such bodies of Christians as may desire it, with a view to the restoration of organic Church Unity.

Conferences.—During these intervening years, such conferences have been held, and there has been in addition considerable correspondence on the subject—chiefly with Commissions appointed for this purpose by the Presbyterian General Assembly, the General Synod of Evangelical Lutherans, the United General Council South of the Evangelical Lutherans, and the Provincial Council of the Moravians. The work of the Commission has been supplemented by an unofficial, yet widely representative organisation known as the Church Unity Society.

While there may not have been as yet any very tangible results from these labours, they have unquestionably aided to a very considerable extent in dispelling ignorance and prejudice, and have brought many persons to recognise as they had never done before the sinfulness and unprofitableness of the multiform divisions among the professed disciples of the one Christ and Lord.

The Bishops' Report of 1886.—The Committee of Bishops reporting on the subject in 1886, under the chairmanship of the Bishop of Long Island,[1] declared among other things that they believed all persons to be members of the Holy Catholic Church who had been baptized with water in the name of the Trinity; that the Church does not seek to absorb other communions, but rather, in co-operation with them on the basis of a common Faith and Order, to heal the wounds of Christ's Body; and, to this end, that she is ready in all matters of merely human ordering or choice to forgo her own preferences.

The report concluded with these words: 'We furthermore affirm that the Christian unity now so earnestly desired by the memorialists[2] can be restored only by the

[1] The Right Rev. Dr. Littlejohn.

[2] Referring to a memorial on the subject presented at the General Convention, and signed by over eleven hundred clergy and three thousand laymen, mainly through the efforts of the Rev. Samuel F. Hotchkin of Philadelphia.

return of all Christian Communions to the principles of unity exemplified by the undivided Catholic Church during the first ages of its existence, which principles we believe to be the substantial deposit of Christian Faith and Order committed by Christ and His Apostles to the Church unto the end of the world, and, therefore, incapable of compromise or surrender by those who have been ordained to be its stewards and trustees for the common and equal benefit of all men.'

Then followed a declaration of what the Committee deemed to be inherent parts of this sacred deposit, and therefore essential to the restoration of unity among the divided branches of Christendom.

The Chicago Lambeth Declaration.—This declaration was adopted by the House of Bishops as reported; but, inasmuch as it was in part amplified by the Lambeth Conference of 1888, and as then promulgated not only expresses the mind of the American Church but of the whole Anglican Communion, this latter form[1] is here printed, as the only Eirenicon, practically, now before the whole Christian world:—

1. The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as containing all things necessary to salvation, and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith;

2. The Apostles' Creed, as the Baptismal Symbol, and the Nicene Creed, as the sufficient statement of the Christian Faith;

3. The two Sacraments, ordained by Christ Himself—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord—ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of institution and of the elements ordained by Him;

4. The Historic Episcopate locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the Unity of His Church.[2]

Influenced by this same eirenical spirit, friendly relations have for many years been maintained with

[1] Familiarly known as the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral.

[2] This section is worded exactly as it was at Chicago. The language of the other sections is but slightly altered.

leading representatives of the Oriental Churches, chiefly through the instrumentality of the Right Rev. Charles R. Hale, D.D., Bishop-Coadjutor of Springfield.

Statistics of Growth.—While statistics of most kinds are only an approximation to the truth, and this rule applies generally to ecclesiastical figures, yet, even in their incompleteness, they furnish something of a basis upon which one may predicate comparisons of growth.

But few figures are within reach as to the statistical condition of the American Church at the beginning of the nineteenth century. There were only 11 dioceses, with about 215 clergymen, including 7 bishops. The number of communicants can only be surmised; but it is not likely that they exceeded, if they quite reached, 10,000.

In 1906 there were in the United States 62 dioceses and 25 missionary jurisdictions, with about 5160 clergymen, including 105 bishops, and about 850,000 communicants. This latter number would represent over four million members and adherents. The ratio of communicants to the entire population has steadily improved. In 1850, it was one in three hundred; in 1900, it is almost one in one hundred.[1]

Although even this improved condition is not entirely satisfactory to those who believe so strongly in the transcendent claims of the Church to the confidence and allegiance of the entire community, yet it furnishes ground for hope that with the blessing of God she will become more and more recognised as the centre of American Christianity.

Others' Second Choice.—Among nine-tenths of those who are not now her members—belonging to those sadly numerous divisions from which she is so continually gaining considerable accessions—the sentiment towards her to-day is the same as that of which the great Bishop Berkeley wrote during his temporary residence at Newport, Rhode Island. 'Here,' he says in a letter home, 'are four sorts of Anabaptists, besides Presbyterians,

[1] The amount of contributions for various ecclesiastical objects during the year 1905 was something over $15,250,000.

Quakers, Independents, and many of no profession at all. . . . They all agree in one point, that *the Church of England is the second best.*'

Henry Clay's Declaration.—Henry Clay of Kentucky (1777-1852) was one of America's greatest and most honoured statesmen. Judge Sheffey of Virginia, in one of his speeches at the General Convention in Boston 1877, thus quoted the testimony of the distinguished senator: 'In one of the darkest hours of the country's fortune, when calamity and sadness brooded over the minds of men, Henry Clay was asked what, in his judgment, constituted the hopes for the future of this country. He, with an eye that gleamed—not a glazed eye, but an eye that gleamed with a prophetic faith—replied, My hope of the future of my country is in the Supreme Court of the United States, and in the Protestant Episcopal Church—the two great bulwarks of liberty and order, of stability and peace.'[1] If her members be but true to their opportunities and resources, these words, by God's blessing, will, so far as the Church is concerned, be amply verified in the yet more glorious history which awaits her in the future.

[1] This statement as to Henry Clay has been verified of late to the author by several of the lineal descendants of the illustrious statesman.

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF PRINCIPAL EVENTS

A.D.	
1579.	First Church services in the United States.
1583.	First charter to English colonists.
1587.	First Church services in North Carolina.
1587.	First baptism.
1602-3.	First Church services in New England.
1607.	First Church built and services held in Virginia.
1619.	First legislative meeting in Jamestown.
1691.	Charter obtained for William and Mary College.
1719.	First Church Convention at Williamsburg, Virginia.
1722.	Consecration of Bishops Welton and Talbot.
1735-6.	Visit to America of the Wesleys and Whitefield.
1735.	First mention of Sunday-schools.
1783.	Church Convention at Annapolis, Maryland.
1784.	Preliminary meeting of clergy at New Brunswick, N.J.
1784.	Consecration of Bishop Seabury.
1784.	Adoption of Provisional Constitution.
1785.	First ordination in America.
1785.	First General Convention in Philadelphia.
1785-9.	The Prayer-Book revised and set forth.
1786.	First consecration of a Church.
1787.	Consecration of Bishops White and Provoost.
1789.	Constitution adopted.
1790.	Consecration of Bishop Madison.
1792.	First consecration of a bishop in America (Dr. Claggett).
1793.	First coloured church organised.
1801.	The Articles of Religion established.
1821.	The General Theological Seminary founded.
1829.	Mission to Greece established.
1835.	Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society founded.
1835.	First missionaries go to China.
1835.	First Domestic Missionary Bishops elected.
1835-6.	Missionaries go to Africa.
1842.	Nashotah founded.
1845.	Sisterhoods first established.
1846.	Bishop Southgate goes to Turkey.
1859.	First missionaries go to Japan.
1861-5.	Civil War and Reunion.
1873.	First bishop for the Indians consecrated.
1874.	Deposition of Bishop Cummins.
1874.	First Church Congress held.
1880-92.	Revision of the Prayer-Book.
1886.	Declaration of House of Bishops on Christian Unity.

PRESIDING BISHOPS OF THE AMERICAN CHURCH.

NO.	NAME.	SEE.	TERM OF SERVICE.
1	William White,	Pennsylvania,	1789
2	Samuel Seabury,	Connecticut,	1789-1792
3	Samuel Provoost,	New York,	1792-1795
4	William White,	Pennsylvania,	1795-1836
5	Alexander Viets Griswold,	The Eastern Diocese,	1836-1843
6	Philander Chase,	Ohio,	1843-1852
7	Thomas Church Brownell,	Connecticut,	1852-1865
8	John Henry Hopkins,	Vermont,	1865-1868
9	Benjamin Bosworth Smith,	Kentucky,	1868-1884
10	Alfred Lee,	Delaware,	1884-1887
11	John Williams,	Connecticut,	1887-1899
12	Thomas March Clark,	Rhode Island,	1899-1903
13	Daniel Sylvester Tuttle,		1903-

GENERAL CONVENTIONS.

PLACE OF MEETING.	DATE.	PLACE OF MEETING.	DATE.
Philadelphia,	1785	Philadelphia,	1838
Philadelphia,	1786	New York,	1841
Wilmington, Delaware (Adjourned Convention),	1786	Philadelphia,	1844
Philadelphia,	1789	New York,	1847
Philadelphia (Adjourned Convention),	1789	Cincinnati,	1850
New York,	1792	New York,	1853
Philadelphia,	1795	Philadelphia,	1856
Philadelphia (Special),	1799	Richmond, Va.,	1859
Trenton, New Jersey,	1801	New York,	1862
New York,	1804	Philadelphia,	1865
Baltimore,	1808	New York,	1868
New Haven, Conn.,	1811	Baltimore,	1871
Philadelphia,	1814	New York,	1874
New York,	1817	Boston,	1877
Philadelphia,	1820	New York,	1880
Philadelphia (Special),	1821	Philadelphia,	1883
Philadelphia,	1823	Chicago,	1886
Philadelphia,	1826	New York,	1889
Philadelphia,	1829	Baltimore,	1892
New York,	1832	Minneapolis,	1895
Philadelphia,	1835	Washington, D.C.,	1898
		San Francisco,	1901
		Boston,	1904

Richmond, Virginia, is appointed as the place for 1907.

INDEX

Africa, missions to, 89.
Anne, Queen, sympathy for the American Church, 37.
Articles of Religion, their authority, 59, 60.
Asbury, Methodist 'Superintendent,' 55.
Athanasian Creed, its use dropped, 54.
Auchmuty, Rev. S., work in old New York, 21.

Baltimore, Lord, on the Church in Maryland, 3.
Baptism, controversy on, 82.
Berkeley, Bishop, 26, 107.
Bray, Dr., and missions in America, 11.
Breck, Rev. James Lloyd, and the Church revival, 79.
Brotherhood of St. Andrew, 102.

Carroll, Roman Catholic Bishop, 4.
Cathedrals, 102.
Charters, religious character of early, 3, 7, 16.
Chicago-Lambeth declaration, 105.
China, missions to, 86.
Choirs, 62, 72.
Christian Unity, movement for, 103 *ff.*
Church Congress, 102.
Civil War, its effect on the Church, 72.

Claggett, Bishop, 54.
Coke, 'consecration' of, by Wesley, 55.
Columbia University, 92.
Concordat with Scottish Bishops, 40.
Convention, general, how constituted, 65.
Coxe, Bishop, 78.
Cummins, Bishop, schism of, 82.
Cutler, Timothy, Puritan convert, 25.

'Daughters of the King,' 101.
Deaconesses, 101.
Declaration of the Church's Rights, 46.
—— on Christian Unity, 105.
De Koven, Rev. J., his defence of the Real Presence, 77.
Delaware, first Church services in, 4.
Dix, Rev. Morgan, 97.
Doane, Bishop, 99.
Drake, Sir Francis, 1.

Eastern diocese, 67.
Eastward position, immemorial in parts of U.S.A., 76.
Eliot, Rev. John, work among Red Indians, 18.
Episcopate, prolonged need of, 35.

Fletcher, Rev. F., holds first Church services in U.S.A., 1.

Franklin, Benjamin, his affection for the Prayer Book, 43.
Free and Open Churches, 103.

General Convention, first, 51.
—— —— constitution of, 65.
General Theological Seminary, 94.
Greece, educational work in, 86.
Griswold, Bishop, 67.

Haiti, mission to, 89.
Hobart College, 93.
Hoffman, Dean, 94.
—— Rev. C. F., 96.
Holy Cross, Order of, 101.
Hymnal, revision of, 61, 99.

Independence, declaration of, mainly the work of Churchmen, 44.
Indians, mission work among, 18 *ff*, 90.
Ingoldsby, Lieutenant-Governor, persecution by, 4.

Jamestown, Va., first Church services at, 2.
Japan, missions to, 88.
Jews, missions to, 91.

Keith, Rev. G., 13.
Kenyon College, 93.
Kilgour, Bishop of Aberdeen, 40.

Laud, Archbishop, 34.
Laymen in convention, 65.
Lehigh University, 92.
Littlejohn, Bishop, 104.
London, Bishop of, in charge of colonies, 11, 34.

Macsparran, Rev. Dr., on New England in old times, 26.
M'Ilvaine, Bishop, 100.
Maine, early Church services in, 3.
Manteo, Indian chief, 18.
Maryland, toleration in, mainly due to Churchmen, 9.
Methodists in America, 31, 55 *ff*.
Muhlenberg, Rev. W. A., organ ises first sisterhood, 101.

Name of the Church, 47.
Nashotah Seminary, 78.
Negroes, work amongst, 18, 85, 90.
New York, religious condition of, in 1704, 12.
—— —— Trinity Church, 96.

Oglethorpe, General, and the Wesleys, 28, 31.
Oriental Churches, friendly relations with, 88, 106.

Parish clerks, 5.
Pastoral letters, 64.
Payment of clergy in tobacco, 5.
Pennsylvania, first Church services in, 4.
Persecution of the Church by Puritans, 8 *ff*, 23, 41.
Pocahontas, Indian princess, 2.
Polk, Bishop, a major-general in the Confederate Army, 74.
Prayer Book, revision of, in 1786-9, 50, 54; in 1892, 98.
Provincial system, 103.
Provoost, Bishop, 51.

'Reformed Episcopal Church,' 83.
Revolution, clergy and the, 41, 42.
Ritual, controversies on, 72, 76.

Seabury, Bishop, first bishop of the Church in U.S.A., 39 *ff*.
Secker, Archbishop, his desire for bishops in America, 37.
Sisterhoods, 101.
Slaves, baptism of, 19, 21, 91.
Smith, Captain John, 2.
Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, 11, 25, 29, 37, 44.
—— of St. John the Evangelist, 101.
South Carolina, early Church services in, 4.

Southgate, Bishop, mission to the East, 87.
Sunday Schools, 95.
Surpliced Choirs in the eighteenth century, 63.

Talbot, Nonjuring Bishop, 38.
—— Rev. John, 13.
Temperance Society, 102.
Trinity College, Hartford, 93.
Turkey, mission to, 87.

University of the South, 93.

Van Rensselaer, Rev. N., first clergyman at New York, 4.
Vesey, Rev. W., his report in 1745, 17.
Virginia, first Church services in, 2.
—— Theological Seminary, 95.

Washington, George, a communicant of the Church, 43.
Welton, Nonjuring Bishop, 38.
Wesley, Rev. Charles, 31, 56.
—— Rev. John, in Georgia, 28; his inconsistency, 57.
Whipple, Bishop, his devotion to the Indians, 90.
White, Bishop, 51.
Whitefield, Rev. George, 31.
William and Mary College, 7.

Yale University, 25.

GTU Library
2400 Ridge Road
Berkeley, CA 94709
For renewals call (510) 649-2500
All items are subject to recall

GTU Library
3 2400 00686 3223